

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, May 13, 1993

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We are grateful, O God, for all the influences that help us see the demands of the day and the road for tomorrow. For the good traditions of our Nation when justice is served, we are thankful; for the freedoms that make us proud and for the liberties that allow us to serve others, we offer our praise. For families and friends who care for us and seek our best and whose concern is greater than we can ever know, we remember with appreciation. Help us, gracious God, to live each day with the spirit of gratitude and thanksgiving for all the gifts we have received and to offer our praise that Your spirit is ever with us and will never depart from us. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRANKS] will please come forward and lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 214) "An Act to authorize the construction of a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor members of the Armed Forces who served in World War II and to commemorate United States participation in that conflict."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair announces that there will be a recognition of not more than 15 Members from each side for 1-minute requests.

A PENSIONLESS FUTURE

(Mr. PICKLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to call the attention of my colleagues to an article appearing on the front page of today's Washington Post entitled, "A Pensionless Future?" This article highlights the very real problem that our society faces in preparing for the retirement of today's workers. Unless we increase the rate of retirement savings, starting this year, tens of millions of today's workers will find themselves destitute in their golden years.

And it is for this reason that I introduced H.R. 298 earlier this year to require employers to properly fund their pension plans. For the past year the Subcommittee on Oversight of the Committee on Ways and Means has investigated this problem and has received extensive reports from the U.S. General Accounting Office, the Congressional Budget Office, and the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation. The facts are clear. A small minority of large employers in this country have chosen to seriously underfund their pension plans. Today the unfunded current liabilities in private pension plans exceed \$51 billion, and that figure has grown rapidly over the past few years. Even worse, the PBGC, which guarantees these pension promises, currently has a deficit of \$2.7 billion, more than double its deficit in 1989.

When an employer shortchanges the company pension plan and then encounters financial difficulty it is the workers and the PBGC that bear the loss. The subcommittee has received direct, personal testimony from workers who have lost over a third of their promised benefits. Every month, for the rest of their lives, their monthly pension checks will be several hundred dollars short, because their pension plan was not properly funded.

A major reason their plan was not funded was because the law does not require employers to fully fund their pension promises. Therefore, when a company gets into economic trouble, it cuts back on funding its pension plan. When a company can't afford to pay higher salaries, it makes unfunded pension promises. And the union leaders and corporate managers agree to these empty promises because it allows them to look good in negotiating pay and benefits today, while shifting the risks to future taxpayers and retirees. The

GAO found that in 1991 among eight of the largest underfunded pension plans, unfunded liabilities increased by \$5 billion, of which \$2 billion was due to new benefit promises.

There is no dispute about the facts of this situation. However, there is great reluctance to address this problem because it is never convenient for some to pay their bills. It is for this reason that the United Auto Workers have testified against any requirement that their pension plans be better funded, even though their plans are underfunded by over \$14 billion. They are absolutely opposed to any change in the funding rules because they are currently negotiating a new pay and benefit agreement to replace their current contract, which expires in September 1993. If the past is any indication, we can expect that these negotiations will result in additional billions in unfunded pension promises.

H.R. 298, the Pension Funding Improvement Act of 1993 would put a stop to this abuse. I had hoped that this measure could have been advanced as part of this year's budget reconciliation bill. Unfortunately that effort was thwarted because the administration opposed taking any action to correct these pension abuses prior to September 1993. The administration has assured the subcommittee that it will propose reform legislation of its own at that time, and the subcommittee members eagerly await that proposal. Of course, there is a world of difference between proposing and enacting legislation. In the meantime, the problem will undoubtedly get worse and the solutions more unpleasant. I personally am deeply disappointed that we have, by not including these provisions in the reconciliation bill, missed what is perhaps our best opportunity to address the problem this year.

Everyone always has a good reason for waiting until a later day to fund their pension plans. But if we don't start making those hard decisions today we will all be the losers in the future.

THE HOMAGE VICE PAYS TO VIRTUE

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, a French philosopher once said, "Hypocrisy is the homage that vice pays to virtue."

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

This statement came to me as I learned that the Clinton administration has requested \$7.5 million in additional funding for the White House staff.

On February 9, 1993, the President stated:

Our White House will be leaner but more effective * * *. I should point out that this is one of the few times in this century that any President has actually shrunk the size of White House staff.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the truth is the White House staff has not shrunk.

There are now 527 warm bodies at the White House compared with 398 in 1992, an increase of over 100 employees. With this supplemental appropriation, the White House staff will expand again by up to 200 more employees.

The White House has indeed paid homage to the idea of shrinking its staff. But it has shown hypocrisy by not following through on that virtuous proclamation.

DEFICIT REDUCTION TRUST FUND: NO GIMMICKS

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to applaud the President for endorsing an idea that many of us have been working on for over the past year or so, the deficit reduction trust fund, by which money from any new taxes raised would go to deficit reduction.

Now, some, I am interested to see, some opponents of this, have called this a gimmick. Now, they are the ones that gave us the last three Gramm-Rudman's; they sure worked, didn't they? They gave us a \$4 trillion deficit, they gave us the lowest economic growth in anybody's recent memory, and they gave us the lowest rate of job growth. They killed the jobs bill. They are the opponents. That is why I am for it.

Now, the cuts in the deficit reduction package that the President put forward outnumbered tax increases better than a 1-to-1 ratio. The important thing here, though, is that Americans are being asked for shared sacrifice—and the message that I get at town meetings is, "Bob, we want to do our share. We want to make sure everyone is involved, and we want to make sure that there is true deficit reduction."

Well, with the deficit reduction trust fund, that keeps the trust with the American people, says that there is true deficit reduction and that you are sharing and you are seeing a result.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN JORDAN AND MEMBERS OF THE CLARK, NJ, VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT

(Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize the actions of John Jordan, from Rhode Island, and the members of the Clark, NJ, Volunteer Fire Department. For the last month, John Jordan has been risking his life in Sarajevo, responding to fires caused by Serbian shelling. The fires light up the scene, making the firefighters prime targets for the Serbian snipers and mortar shells. To date, a dozen firefighters have been killed in the line of duty.

These Sarajevo firefighters lack almost everything they need, and yet they continue. The Clark, NJ, Volunteer Fire Department, recognizing their need, has agreed to donate their retired fire pumper to the firemen's brigade of Sarajevo. The engine began the long trip to Sarajevo last night, when it was transported to upstate New York for renovation.

Mr. Speaker, the 14,000 citizens of Clark, NJ, are exhibiting what is best about this country. Within the next couple of weeks, engine No. 4, painted in red with Clark, NJ in gold, will be helping to protect life and property in the war-torn streets of Sarajevo.

PRESIDENT CLINTON HAS BEGUN OUR ECONOMIC CLIMB BACK UP

(Mr. VISCLOSKEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VISCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, during the past 12 years Republican Presidents Reagan and Bush bulldozed this Nation into a \$4 trillion hole of debt. What we found at the bottom of this pit of debt was unemployment, failing schools, crumbling roads and bridges.

President Clinton was elected to change the practices of the past two administrations and began our economic climb back. That is what he is doing.

The Clinton economic plan reduced the deficit by over \$500 billion, makes over 200 specific spending cuts, and invests in job creation. He also assures that we have investments for our Nation's future and, yes, he does raise revenue. But the revenue measures are fair and balanced in their approach.

For example, during the 1950's, the 1960's, during the height of our postwar economic growth, corporate taxes represented 4.4 percent of GDP. They have fallen to 1.7 percent.

In light of this, the President has proposed a modest rate increase for corporate America that will raise between \$5 billion to \$6 billion annually, a reasonable proposal to make the tax system of our country fairer for the average working families and to reduce the burden on our grandchildren.

CORRESPONDING WITH THE PRESIDENT

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, remember when Bill Clinton said:

We in government cannot ask the American people to change if we will not do the same.

He made this pitch as he announced his plan to cut the White House staff by 25 percent. Clinton started that process by firing 20 employees of the White House correspondence unit, the group that responds to letters from constituents.

Well, according to the administration's supplemental appropriation request, the President has received a lot of mail.

In this funding request, the President asked for more than \$1 million to be used by the correspondence unit, probably to hire the 20 previously fired employees.

Instead of hiring more people to answer his mail for him, the President should read some of it for himself.

Then he will understand that the American people want some real change from the White House, not empty promises of phony budget cuts.

□ 1010

IN SUPPORT OF SINGLE-PAYER HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

(Mr. OLVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, the word is out. A single-payer system of health care is popular with Americans and it is the real solution to health care cost containment.

The Congressional Budget Office has confirmed that adopting the single-payer system could cover everyone and still save \$14.2 billion.

I want to share with you a letter from a neighbor in Massachusetts—but he could easily be any of your neighbors.

He tells me both his sister and daughter are suffering from cancer. His sister did not have insurance and could not afford the doctor when she discovered a lump in her breast. And now his daughter cannot afford the procedure to cure her cervical cancer. I can think of no better reason to reform our health care system than these two people who may not live because they cannot afford basic health care.

Eighty percent of the thousands who attended my health care forums raised their hands and voted for a single-payer system. They want to stop the exploding cost of health care and provide health security for every American citizen. So do I, and that is why I

urge my colleagues to support a single-payer system.

DEMOCRATS AND ADMINISTRATION NEED TO GET THE BIG PICTURE

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration thinks big is better. We have got big Government, big spending, big regulations, and soon, we will have really big taxes. In this big bureaucracy, what is small business going to do?

Each year, Government regulations cost this country over \$400 billion big ones. Small businesses alone spend 1 billion hours and \$100 billion just completing Government paperwork.

You know, on the campaign trail, the Democrat in the White House pledged to help small businesses. But since January, the only relief that he has offered is more than 27,000 pages of new regulations.

The administration and the Democrats in Congress need to get the big picture. If we do not reduce Government, reduce spending, and reduce regulations, small businesses and the whole Nation will be in big trouble.

Americans still do not want, do not need, and do not deserve more taxes and bigger Government.

DEFICIT REDUCTION TRUST FUND IS NO GIMMICK

(Ms. HARMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, as one of the five original architects of the deficit reduction trust fund in the House, I am delighted that the President has decided to make our plan one of his major budget proposals.

This plan is no gimmick. This deficit reduction trust fund represents a guarantee to our constituents that our collective sacrifices will not be in vain.

It makes clear that all revenues raised under the budget proposal are for deficit reduction, and any new spending is matched by spending cuts. We need a pay-as-you-go system for Government so that we can balance our checkbook at last.

For the past 12 years, our Government has run on the philosophy of spend now, and worry about the bill later. This deficit reduction trust fund is an attempt to shift that mindset. It is a formula to pay our bills when the debt is incurred, and to pay down our deficit now so that our children and their children will not be burdened with this generation's spending.

I commend the President for this bold step, I urge this House, both

Democrats and Republicans, to unify behind his plan to end our addiction to deficit spending.

LISTEN TO PRESIDENT, BUT WATCH WHAT HE DOES

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, with a flurry of publicity, the White House took great pride in announcing a 25-percent cut in White House staffs a couple months ago. Now we see a supplemental appropriations bill going through the Congress which will result in a new increase of almost 10 percent in the total money available to the White House for administration. That is over and above last year's appropriation level, by the way.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one more example of why the American people would be well-advised to listen to the President's speeches, but also to watch and see what he actually does.

PRESIDENT IS ON RIGHT TRACK WITH DEFICIT REDUCTION TRUST FUND

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, on February 17 on the rostrum just behind me, the President of the United States speaking to Congress and to the Nation indicated how important deficit reduction was for the economic health and future of our country. He indicated then that deficit reductions would lower the interest rates, create capital, create jobs, and grow the economy.

Yesterday the President took that message another step by indicating his desire to have created a trust fund into which would go for deficit reduction alone the net gain in tax increases and the net gain in spending reductions.

I salute the President, Mr. Speaker, on having made this very strong statement in behalf of a lower deficit and in behalf of a stronger economy.

Several of us on the Hill have sent letters to the President recently encouraging him in this direction, saying that we would support him in legislative efforts to accomplish that creation of a trust fund.

Once again I think the President is definitely on the right track. Reduce the deficits and we improve the economy.

LOOK AT PERFORMANCE, NOT GIMMICKRY

(Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, it is getting harder and harder in this town to have any confidence in what is being said. Indeed, it is harder and harder to even understand what is being said.

First we heard we are going to have a focus on the economy. It turns out rather than a laser beam, it was more like a strobe light.

Then we heard we are going to reduce taxes on the middle class. Now we know that a Btu tax will extend those taxes down to poverty levels for families.

We were told we were going to reduce the cost of the staff in the White House. Now we know there is an additional request for appropriations to staff the White House.

So today we hear a new example of gimmickry, that is the trust fund to reduce the deficit.

My friends, the only way to reduce the deficit is to reduce spending. You can have all the new taxes you choose over here in the trust fund. As long as the other side of the equation goes up faster, you have not achieved anything.

We have a way to check that. You can check that by the debt, by the way the debt grows. So let us not talk about gimmickry. Let us take a look at performance and make some changes. Reform is by taking a look at the growth of the debt. Gimmickry will not help it.

DEFICIT REDUCTION TRUST FUND MAKES SENSE

(Mr. EDWARDS of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to applaud President Clinton for proposing a deficit reduction trust fund. This fund will insure that new taxes will go to reducing the Federal deficit. It insures that new taxes will not be spent on pork barrel or new spending programs.

This is a commonsense idea. Even those who oppose new taxes should support this idea, that is if we are to have new taxes let us not waste that money. Let us spend it on deficit reduction.

Nothing in this plan prevents Congress from passing additional spending cuts.

Mr. Speaker, some Members of Congress have called this reduction plan a gimmick. I hope the American people will remember that many of these critics are the architects of our \$4 trillion national debt. To give credibility to their criticism of this reduction plan is like listening to Al Capone on law enforcement or Bonnie and Clyde on banking regulations.

Mr. Speaker, the deficit reduction trust fund plan makes sense and deserves our support.

AN EMPTY PROMISE

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton now has proposed putting taxes into a trust to reduce the Federal deficit.

This, from the same person who promised Americans a tax cut, no energy tax, and that he would not tamper with Social Security.

Actually, this latest proposal is an improvement. Mr. Clinton has gone from broken promises to an empty promise.

This so-called trust fund will not cut spending one dollar, it will not reduce the deficit one dollar, and it will not put one more dollar into the pockets of Americans.

What it does do is remind us we have two deficits—the financial deficit and the trust deficit.

The financial deficit will be solved when we cut spending and cut taxes—not increase them.

The trust deficit will be solved when we elect more fiscally responsible Members of Congress and when Mr. Clinton remembers to keep the promises he made to the American people.

President Clinton should remember Abraham Lincoln's advice:

It is true that you may fool all of the people some of the time; you can even fool some of the people all the time, but you can't fool all of the people all of the time.

□ 1020

CHANGE, NOT CHANCE

(Mr. CLYBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, we have seen what a few wily apostates can do to this Nation's people when they opt to place politics above principles.

Most of our friends on the other side would have the American public believe that chances are the voodoo economics of the Reagan-Bush years will soon yield some positive results.

Mr. Speaker, last November a majority of America voted for change, not chance.

We cannot leave it to chance that this Nation's economy will heal itself and the deficit will reduce itself.

We cannot leave to chance jobs and educational opportunities for America's people.

We cannot leave it to chance that our children will become healthy, well-adjusted adults prepared for tomorrow's challenges if we do not make some fundamental changes today.

We must stop the pillaging of this Nation's households and restore dignity and respect to America's families.

It is time to support President Clinton's plan for economic growth and fundamental change.

CONNECTICUT CELEBRATING TAX FREEDOM DAY ON MAY 14—THIS YEAR

(Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commemorate Friday, May 14, as Tax Freedom Day in my home State of Connecticut.

According to the Tax Foundation Research Group, Mr. Speaker, the average American spends the first 123 days working to pay their Federal, State, and local taxes. In Connecticut we need to work an extra 11 days before we can have enough to pay off our tax burden. Thanks to the Connecticut Legislature, Connecticut's workers toil for the government almost a month longer than the workers of South Dakota. Only two States in the country have the dubious distinction of celebrating Tax Freedom Day on a later date than Connecticut.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, if the President's proposed tax increases are enacted, we will all be celebrating Tax Freedom Day even later next year, and I doubt that those extra days of working for the government will prove worthwhile.

MILITARY BAN ON GAY MEN AND LESBIANS

(Mr. NADLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, hearings in the other body on Tuesday featured the drama of testimony by Marine Col. Fred Peck opposing the President's plan to end antigay discrimination in the military while revealing that his own son is gay. It is not a question of prejudice, Colonel Peck assured the Nation: it is just that gay men and lesbians are not suited for military service.

Sometimes, however, people tell more about themselves than they mean to. So it was with Colonel Peck. In discussing his son, Colonel Peck made a remarkable statement, and I quote:

If he walked into a recruiter's office, he would be a dream come true—6-1, blue-eyed, blond hair.

Blue-eyed. Blond hair. What is it, in Colonel Peck's value system, that makes such coloring the ideal—a dream come true—for military service? Hair color? Eye color? What kinds of standards are those for fitness for military service? Quite unintentionally, Colonel Peck made it abundantly clear how narrow a view he takes of the ideal qualities for a soldier. It is hard to believe that the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. Colin Powell, would agree.

TAX PROPOSALS AND BUDGETARY GIMMICKRY

(Mr. LAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, we know the President's tax proposals are in trouble when he has to resort to old-fashioned smoke and mirrors in order to rescue them.

The Clinton administration has gone to great lengths to promise no more accounting tricks. It has taken barely 100 days for this promise to be jettisoned.

The President is now proposing a trust fund to house the tax increases earmarked for deficit reduction. This is nothing less than budgetary legerdemain. All revenues are fungible. How they are accounted for is irrelevant insofar as economic impact is concerned, but obviously, Mr. Clinton believes it plays well politically.

But accounting gimmicks cannot change the fiscal fundamentals, and the bottom line fundamental is how much the Government must borrow. No matter how the accounts are jiggled or rearranged or reconstructed, the amount the Government must borrow in any given year is the only deficit that counts. The markets know this and so do the American people.

This political ploy is nothing less than a disingenuous attempt to create credibility that has gone away. Our deficit problem is too important and too serious for phoney budgeting.

SUPPORT THE DEFICIT REDUCTION TRUST FUND

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President proposed a deficit reduction trust fund, and it did not take more than a minute for the other side to knock it.

Mr. Speaker, what are they afraid of? At the very least it is not going to do any harm, and it certainly, in the words of an economist, can do a lot of good.

I will tell my colleagues what the other party is afraid of: Very simply, under 12 years of their watch the deficit climbed. The thing that makes the other party quake in their boots is the fact that the deficit may actually be reduced under, of all people, Democrats. And the deficit reduction trust fund that the President has proposed, while not affecting future taxes and not affecting future cuts, says that everyone of us, Democrat, Republican, liberal, conservative, House, Senate, White House, Congress, we must put our money where our mouth is.

Yes, we are voting these painful cuts and taxes, my colleagues, but, yes, we are guaranteeing to the public that

those taxes and those cuts go to deficit reduction and not pork.

I urge my colleagues to support the deficit reduction trust fund, especially those on the other side of the aisle. It is the kind of thing they have been advocating for a long time.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S EMPLOYER-MANDATED HEALTH PLAN

(Mr. RAMSTAD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration floated another health care trial balloon yesterday.

They want to require employers to provide health coverage—by spending a fixed percentage of payroll—for all their workers.

This pay or play plan would literally signal doom for many of America's small businesses and the millions of workers they employ.

The Joint Economic Committee estimates that at least 710,000 jobs would be lost in the first year alone.

The administration also said employers would be required to spend 7 or 8 percent of their payroll on health care.

So even if a company can provide excellent coverage for its employees for 6.5 percent of its payroll, the Clinton administration's spending floor will force it to spend even more.

Why does this administration believe government knows better what's good for small businesses than business owners do?

Mr. Speaker, let's not adopt a health care plan that destroys more jobs.

Say no to this payroll tax. Say no to pay or play.

ONCE AGAIN PRESIDENT CLINTON DEMONSTRATES HIS COMMITMENT TO REDUCING THE DEFICIT

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, once again President Clinton has demonstrated his commitment to reducing the deficit. First, Mr. Speaker, he proposed a \$500 billion deficit reduction package. It was serious, no smoke and mirrors. Second, he strongly backed a modified line item veto, and now he has proposed a deficit reduction trust fund to demonstrate that new taxes and spending cuts go into deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a gimmick, this is serious, this is what the public wants, and the reason he is doing it is the American public does not believe that the executive branch and the Congress are really going to put this money that they get from taxes and

spending cuts into deficit reduction. Mr. Speaker, the amounts in this fund are going to be permanently set aside and cannot be used for other purposes.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, the President has stolen his critics' thunder, and he is putting his money where his mouth is, into deficit reduction, into a trust fund that reduces the deficit and does not go to any other purposes.

□ 1030

REINTRODUCTION OF CHILD WELFARE SERVICES REFORM ACT

(Mr. WELDON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, many of us were shocked last week by the story of 2-year-old Donnell Robinson. Donnell passed away late last Tuesday night at Fairfax Hospital due to brain injuries allegedly inflicted by his mother's boyfriend. Many of us were similarly shocked last July when a 6-year-old boy in Baltimore was allegedly abused and starved by his grandmother. The boy's weight was half that of an average child his age and he had a broken arm that had not been set. Unfortunately, these tragedies are not isolated incidents. Events like these happen every day.

Unfortunately, our Federal Child Welfare Services Program does not offer the kind of assistance that State and local governments need. Federal child welfare services did not allow Federal funds to be used for counseling. In the past month, Donnell and his family had been visited by the local social services agency after a babysitter had noticed bruises on the boy's face, back, and buttocks. The social worker had the boyfriend sign an agreement in which he promised to get counseling and guaranteed to never be alone with the boy. Obviously, this did not work. Would it not make sense if Fairfax County had been permitted to use Federal funds to conduct follow-up visits on the condition of Donnell Robinson rather than having the boyfriend sign a bogus agreement?

In addition to not allowing counseling, our current system reimburses States through six different audits. This has created an enormous bureaucracy which has caused administrative costs to rise 1,000 percent since 1981. Our social workers are spending their time filling out forms rather than helping kids.

It is time for Congress to act upon the campaign buzz words of change and reinventing government. For that reason, Congressman ROB ANDREWS and I are, today, reintroducing the Child Welfare Services Reform Act. This bipartisan legislation greatly reduces the overwhelming red tape, and gives States the flexibility to best serve chil-

dren. States will be able to focus on counseling and expanding family preservation programs, without adding to our Federal deficit. Instead, the bill locks into the current CBO 5-year budget projections, providing States flexibility with \$8 billion in slated Federal funds over the next 5 years. We must act to prevent such incidents as the tragedy of Donnell Robinson, and we need to have our colleagues cosponsor the Child Welfare Services Reform Act to reform the way we serve our kids in America.

A SINGLE-PAYER HEALTH CARE SYSTEM

(Ms. WOOLSEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues a recent Congressional Budget Office study conforming that a single-payer health care system will save money.

The CBO concluded that if a single-payer system, with a copayment and deductible, had been in effect in 1991, \$14.2 billion would have been cut from America's health care costs that year. That is 5 percent of the deficit.

Virtually all other health care reform options come with increased national health care costs.

Only a single-payer plan does all four of these things:

First, provides health coverage to everyone.

Second, provides high quality benefits and delivers them through a system that is easily understood.

Third, cuts costs by eliminating billions of dollars in administrative waste and duplication and putting in place real and enforceable cost controls.

Fourth, allows for choice of doctor.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to review the CBO report and to join the other 73 Members who are cosponsors of H.R. 1200, the National Health Security Act, Representative MCDERMOTT's single-payer plan.

IT'S PRESIDENT CLINTON THAT NEEDS A TRUST FUND

(Mr. LINDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday President Clinton announced the creation of a trust fund into which all his new tax money will be put. Of course, it won't lower taxes, it won't lower spending and it therefore won't lower the deficit. Yet somehow this new gimmick is supposed to restore the American people's faith.

Mr. Speaker, it is not the Federal Government that needs another budget gimmick. It is President Clinton that

needs a new trust fund. He needs it because in just over 100 days he has used up all the trust the American people had in this administration. He has used it up because he has broken every promise he has made and he has tried to fix each broken promise by making two more.

A classic example is his statement a few months ago that he would reduce White House staff. Just an hour ago the White House was before the appropriations committee asking for money to restore those people. Instead of cutting staff they are growing staff: their target was 408; in March the level was 512; today the number is 527 and now they have the nerve to ask Congress for 100 to 200 additional positions.

The trust fund gimmick is perhaps the only promise Clinton won't break because it was never intended to do anything in the first place.

FOCUS ON TRUST DEFICIT

(Mr. BACHUS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton must finally be starting to realize just how bad his tax-and-spend economic plan looks, when you clear away all the flowery rhetoric and doublespeak.

Yesterday he announced a trust fund for deficit reduction, in an attempt to reassure the American people that all his new tax increases really will be used to lower the Federal deficit, and not just go for new spending.

Unfortunately for President Clinton, even his fellow Democrats have recognized this for what it is—just a gimmick that doesn't change existing law or anything else. In fact, it's just one more rhetorical patch on the leaky hull of a sinking economic plan.

The American people are not fooled. They have sat at home and watched the President break almost all of his major promises for the past 5 months. Why on Earth should anyone believe him now?

Mr. Clinton would do better to focus on his own trust deficit and start making his actions look a little more like his words.

As far as the budget deficit goes, we will just have to wait and see. Trust fund or not, Mr. Clinton's best-case scenario still calls for adding more than a trillion dollars to the Federal debt.

It will take more than a gimmick to change that.

OUTSTANDING BUSINESS LEADERS FROM HAGERSTOWN

(Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, with creativity, initiative and faith in our system, small business entrepreneurs are the backbone of our economy. Appropriately, the Small Business Administration annually recognizes small business leaders and advocates who consistently pioneer new ideas and encourage growth, development and job creation.

Tomorrow, the Small Business Administration will honor two outstanding allies of small business from Hagerstown, MD. Terry Randall is being recognized as the Small Business Administration's Financial Services Advocate of the Year. For more than 20 years, Terry and his associates have been providing sound financial assistance to promising small businesses and innovative individuals wishing to contribute to the success of the free market system. David Elliott, manager of the enterprising "The Business Spirit" in Hagerstown has been named SBA's Media Advocate of the Year in Maryland for his energetic, skilled and motivating promotion of small business development and expansion in Western Maryland.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud to extend my personal congratulations to Terry Randall and David Elliott and wish them continued success in their businesses. They are outstanding leaders in the Hagerstown community and are a fine example to other small business owners throughout the Nation.

CLINTON'S DEFICIT TRUST FUND TERMED A SHAM, NOT A GIMMICK

(Mr. HOKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in the unusual situation this morning of having to disagree with my friends who have spoken before me on this side who claim this is a gimmick and agreeing with my friends on the other side of the aisle who say it is not a gimmick. It is not a gimmick. It clearly is not a gimmick; it is a sham.

It is a complete sham that is perpetrated on the American people to call this a trust fund. What are we going to do with this money, create another class, a new class of debt?

What is really disturbing about this is that this is so silly a proposal that it calls into question the seriousness of the administration proposing it. Either the President simply does not understand the fundamental budget process, and you cannot squeeze blood out of a turnip that does not exist, or he thinks that the American people are so stupid that they will not see through this. Either way, it clearly undermines the credibility of the administration, and it is one more trial balloon that I predict will come crashing down to Earth.

HUNGARY WANTS DEMOCRACY, BUT WHO PAYS FOR IT?

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, America wants to promote democracy in Hungary so bad that Hungary needed someone to run their state-holding company—a private company owned by the Hungarian Government—but they did not have the money, so Uncle Sam will provide \$100,000 a year to pay the salary of Mr. Taleki to run a private holding company in Hungary to try to get their economy and their Nation in order.

I oppose this. What has happened to the common sense of America? While we are promoting democracy abroad with money we do not have, we have 25,000 murders and millions of kids graduating who cannot read.

If there is going to be democracy in Hungary, the Hungarians are going to have to pay for democracy, not the American taxpayers. I oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, I will be sending a letter to the State Department and to our President asking him to stop this business.

NATIONAL COMPETITIVENESS ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to House Resolution 164 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 820.

□ 1040

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 820) to amend the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 to enhance manufacturing technology development and transfer, to authorize appropriations for the Technology Administration of the Department of Commerce, including the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and for other purposes, with Mr. OBEY (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole House rose on Wednesday, May 12, 1993, title III was open for amendment at any point.

Are there further amendments to title III?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WALKER

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WALKER: Page 62, line 11, insert "The Secretary shall ensure that loans and loan guarantees made

available under this subtitle are made to business concerns which are at least 51 percent owned or controlled by middle-class Americans. Middle-class Americans are defined as those individuals whose Adjusted Gross Income for Federal income tax purposes for the previous year was between \$15,000 and \$85,000." after "including women)."

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, it is disappointing that this bill has become a vehicle for establishing social policy. It was a bill that started off as a competitiveness bill dealing with questions of economic concern, but we have in fact now decided that we are going to make this bill into a social policy bill.

We have adopted set-asides for women and minorities. We have directed the Secretary to identify economically depressed areas so they can be given special treatment. We are making government once again a bank of last resort in this bill.

We are doing all of these things in the bill in the name of competitiveness, for which we are asking the American taxpayer to pay, and for which he is likely to get very little in return.

Now, the one thing that we hear constantly from the American people is then, "Why aren't we ever taken into account?"

Well, this amendment takes them into account. This amendment says that if we are going to use this bill as a vehicle for social policy, then let us assure that the middle class is capable of getting some of the loans under this program. Let us for once designate them specifically. Let us not just have designations for all of the groups out across the country that have special interest concern. Let us for once say that the middle class deserves some consideration.

Mr. Chairman, it is clear the American people do not believe that Government pays any attention to them. The American people do not trust us. They do not think we look out for their interest. They believe they have to pay all the bills and they get shafted.

Well, here is an opportunity in this bill, since we decided to make it into a social policy bill, to say okay, middle class America, you too are eligible for these loans.

Ross Perot's pollster back in the 1992 campaign interviewed people about their reasons for voting for Mr. Perot. Their answers ought to be a signal to us. Congress was repeatedly singled out as a broken institution. Some of the responses from the people were "Congress panders to special interest," and, "They all link arms and hook up with the special interests." The people said over and over again, "They are always shafting the middle class."

Well, middle class America deserves some attention. Since we have decided we are going to categorize people in this bill and we are going to do set-asides, all this amendment says is mid-

dle class America ought to also get the appropriate kind of treatment. So this amendment, if adopted would say to the Secretary, "Your loans should go to middle class America as well as everybody else that is designated in the bill."

Mr. Chairman, I think it is a commonsense amendment. It is the kind of thing we ought to have been doing for a long time, and I would ask my colleagues to adopt the amendment aimed at giving middle class America equitable treatment under the loan provisions of the bill.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the 10 percent minority participation goal set out in the bill as adopted by the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology is a measure intended to redress decades of well-documented discrimination against racial and ethnic minorities and women in the credit market and other areas which have excluded minorities and women from business opportunities.

We have settled the question as to whether or not this part of the bill is in any way a quota measure.

We have settled that yesterday. There was never any question about it, but any possible suggestion has been laid to rest forever.

The introduction of this measure into the legislation in the first place was in our opinion the gentlest effort to suggest to those who administer the program and to draw their attention these certain preexisting or existing problems.

Mr. Chairman, this language has been adopted in numerous laws and supported by the past administration and the one before that, and basically represents the policy of the U.S. Government and the governments of most of the States in this Union, particularly with respect to procurement and business assistance programs like the small business programs.

There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that middle-class individuals have been systematically excluded from business opportunities because of their status as middle-class individuals. As a matter of fact, I might suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] that the whole reason for this legislation was to provide opportunities for middle-class Americans, middle class American business people, to be able to compete with the industrial and technological giants in the United States. The IBM's can take care of themselves. We tried to create a vehicle here that will enable middle-class Americans to get part of the action in the development of technology.

Indeed, to the contrary, as I have stated, the bill is aimed at assisting the middle class, as I have said. Therefore, there is, Mr. Chairman, in our opinion absolutely no reason to create

a set-aside goal for the middle class, since they have not been victims, and, since as I stated, the legislation was created for the middle class.

The Walker amendment, so-called middle-class amendment set-aside, in our opinion demeans, demeans, the well-established policy to bring minorities and women into the economic mainstream and should be strenuously opposed. And I ask my colleagues to again support the committee in opposing Mr. WALKER's demeaning amendment.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I demand the words be taken down.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the words objected to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

□ 1050

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, would it be possible for the House to conduct its business while all of this machination is going on behind the scenes and then when the Chairman finds the answer, to bring it forward?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. OBEY). No, this must be disposed of first. The Clerk is ready to report the words to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania objected.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Walker amendment, so-called middle-class amendment set-aside, in our opinion, demeans, demeans the well-established policy to bring minorities and women into the economic mainstream and should be strenuously opposed. And I ask my colleagues to again support the committee in opposing Mr. WALKER's demeaning amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Committee will now rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. SHARP] having assumed the chair, Mr. OBEY, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 820) to amend the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 to enhance manufacturing technology development and transfer, to authorize appropriations for the Technology Administration of the Department of Commerce, including the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and for other purposes, certain words used in debate were objected to and on request were taken down and read at the Clerk's desk, and he herewith reported the same to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHARP). The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reports that during the consideration of the bill, H.R. 820, certain words used in the debate were objected and, on request, were taken down and

read at the Clerk's desk and does now report the words objected to to the House of Representatives.

The Clerk will report the words objected to in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. The Clerk read as follows:

The Walker amendment, so-called middle-class amendment set-aside, in our opinion, demeans, demeans the well-established policy to bring minorities and women into the economic mainstream and should be strenuously opposed. And I ask my colleagues to again support the committee in opposing Mr. WALKER's demeaning amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHARP). The Chair rules that the use of the language "demeaning" has, as its descriptive objective, the amendment itself and the policy therein and does not go to the motive or the character of the individual who is offering the amendment.

Members may take issue with the description of the amendment, but it is certainly, in this instance, not used to describe the character of the Member or his motives. The words are not unparliamentary.

The Committee will resume its sitting.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 820, with Mr. LANCASTER in the Chair.

□ 1055

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add a few remarks to those made by the chairman of the subcommittee. I think that the comments made by the chairman of the subcommittee were well taken.

I would also make a few other points. The set-aside language that was included in the committee bill, which deals with disadvantaged organizations, goes to the heart of the issue of diversity within the United States of America.

What we are trying to do is include firms using those that are run and operated by minorities and women that have not had an equal opportunity to compete for contracts for many, many years.

The language which spoke of having the Secretary attempt to assure that minorities and women or, actually, those that were economically and socially disadvantaged would have an opportunity to compete for approximately 10 percent of the loans was solely an amendment that said that the Secretary should make an effort. It was not a quota, because it did not require that any percentage of loans go to any particular class of individuals. It just asked the Secretary, it actually required the Secretary to make every effort possible to do so.

Now, compare that to the amendment we have before us now. The

amendment by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] requires, does not have as permissive language, it has as mandatory language that each and every loan under this program go to individuals that are between \$15,000 and \$85,000 to the degree that that individual has a 51-percent stake in the company.

If there is no individual in this company competing for this loan that has an income, a gross adjusted income of \$15,000 to \$85,000, then that individual cannot compete; \$85,001 prohibits one from qualifying for a loan under this program.

I do not know if a person is middle class, if they are \$85,000 or below and if they are \$1 above, they are no longer middle class, but I do know it would be patently unfair to not be able to compete, period, solely because you do not have 51 percent of the ownership of the company, that is, between the income level of \$15,000 and \$85,000.

It seems to me that this amendment goes beyond what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is truly trying to do.

And again, I am not certain what his motives are, but it seems to me that if he is truly trying to address the issue of the middle class, he would not have made it so strict and rigid, which means that only those who are within the income range of \$15,000 to \$85,000 could qualify.

This is beyond the goal. This is beyond the quota, because it is a 100-percent quota for those that are within the \$15,000 to \$85,000 income range.

I would also ask at some point that my colleagues and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] consider how the Department of Commerce would implement this amendment. How are we going to determine, and let us read the language, middle-class Americans are defined as "those individuals whose adjusted gross income for Federal income tax purposes for the previous year was between \$15,000 and \$85,000."

How will the Department of Commerce, which does not have access to people's tax forms, does not have access to a business' tax returns, how would the Department of Commerce determine if there is a firm or individual who owns or operates a firm that has an income level of \$15,000 to \$85,000 adjusted gross income?

That would require the Department of Commerce to then seek out the information from the IRS. It would require the IRS to thereby be able to provide all that information to the Department of Commerce, if, in fact, it is allowed to do so and not prohibited by confidentiality requirements.

□ 1100

There is no way in the world that, under the existing rubric of the Department of Commerce, that it could

achieve the goal in the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]. Again, I think it is an ill-defined amendment. It does not go to the heart of perhaps what the gentleman from Pennsylvania is trying to do, and that is to make sure that the middle-class has a chance to compete against those who are wealthier.

I would agree with the gentleman to that degree if he is trying to make sure the middle class has an opportunity to truly compete, that that be allowed, but I do not see this doing that. All I see it doing is limiting those that could truly compete for worthy loans to those who are between \$15,000 and \$85,000, a very arbitrary limit. I would ask my colleagues to vote against this measure.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, it would seem, and I think my colleagues should consider, that if we are going to give preferential treatment, that we cannot be too narrow in limiting special groups to whom we are going to give this special treatment. The amendment that suggests that we look at middle class America, who has often been disadvantaged by legislation, as the very rich can succeed with their money, where the very poor and the very outcast are sometimes given that preferential treatment, I support the amendment, because there is reasonableness to including a broader frame of Americans that are often left out.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman, I think, makes an excellent point. It is fascinating to hear the debate, first of all, to hear that an amendment designed to protect the middle class is demeaning. That is exactly what all those folks that were talked about by Ross Perot were saying out there. They think that Congress regards anything done for the middle class as being demeaning, and they are sick and tired of a Congress that does not understand the kind of pain they are going through as they pay the taxes. They are sick and tired of a Congress that believes that it is demeaning to include the middle class in these programs. They are sick and tired of the fact that every time the middle class wants something, that it is demeaning for Congress to consider something that is middle class in nature.

We heard an argument a minute ago that says that if a person makes more than \$85,000 they ought to be eligible to compete for these programs. I will tell the Members, the problem is that the people making more than \$85,000 get a chance to go to the banker. They have assets enough to go to the banker to get loans.

What we ought to be doing is thinking about those people who cannot go in to the banker to get the loans to do their small startup business. If we are going to have this loan program, we ought to be doing something about that. The \$85,000 people are pretty well off. They are not rich, but they are pretty well off.

What we have now is the Democrats arguing that \$85,000 a year and up ought to get these loans, that we ought not to give special treatment to the middle class, that in fact we ought not even make them eligible, that it is demeaning to suggest that they are going to be eligible, that it is demeaning to offer an amendment on the floor to suggest that middle-class Americans ought to be given a chance to compete.

I would suggest that much of middle class America does not think it is demeaning. They think it is exactly the kind of thing they have been waiting for, that they are sick and tired of a Congress that consistently ignores their wishes, comes to them only when it is time to pay the bill. Yes, when we want to raise the biggest tax increase in history, boy oh boy, at that time we come to the middle class and say, "You open up your pocketbooks to give us the money," but when it comes to the question of whether or not they should be eligible to compete for loans, no, we want to give those to only people \$85,000 and above. Those are the people that ought to get these loans, and it is demeaning to do something else.

I would submit that if the Members do not think it is demeaning to try to help the middle class, they may want to support this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that his point is well taken. I would hope that the gentleman who made the comment that it was demeaning would consider withdrawing that, because that is really not part of the debate.

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan, and I appreciate the eloquence and vehemence of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], but he has asked us to vote on a specific proposal here, not about his general sentiments about the middle class, but rather about the amendment that is at the desk.

I wonder if the gentleman would care to answer some of the concerns that were raised by my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA]. That is, precisely how we shall implement, if we vote today for this proposal.

For example, I would ask the gentleman, is it truly the intent here, as the gentleman from California said, if we read this amendment, "The Sec-

retary shall ensure that loans and loan guarantees made available," not a percentage but all loans, loans guaranteed under this shall come for individuals who have adjusted gross income between \$15,000 and \$85,000? Is it the gentleman's intent that no one under \$15,000 nor anyone over \$85,000, even by \$1, should be in any way able to participate in the benefit of this program at all, whatsoever? Is that the gentleman's intent?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as the major sponsor.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, the intent of the amendment is to make the middle class eligible. The gentleman may want to interpret it as including all loans. I do not see the word "all" anywhere in here. That is the gentleman's interpretation.

The intent of the amendment is to make middle-class people between \$15,000 and \$85,000 eligible for loans in the program, and if it is needed for me to say that eligibility is the intention here, they now have that statement for the legislative history.

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, if I could continue to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] if he would consider continuing this dialogue for just a moment, he suggests that it is my interpretation. I would be happy to yield to him if he would tell me how else I should interpret the following language: "The Secretary shall ensure that loans and loan guarantees made available under this subtitle are made to business concerns which are at least 51 percent owned or controlled by middle class Americans," which then has gone on to be defined as adjusted gross income between \$15,000 and \$85,000.

I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, how else should I interpret the language, other than that if we were to vote for this amendment, despite his eloquent statement of intent to the middle class, how else should I interpret it, other than every single dollar loaned under this program must go to someone with an adjusted gross income between those incomes?

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINGERHUT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman was the one who a few minutes ago said that the amendment contained the word "all." It does not say that. It simply says that the Secretary shall ensure they are made available to the business concerns that are middle-class oriented. I am saying to the gentleman that he can vote against this if he wants, if he thinks

that people \$85,000 and above ought to be the ones getting all of this. If he thinks the rich in the country ought to get all these loans, go ahead and vote against the amendment.

I am saying that I think the middle class ought to be taken into account, and that it is a question of eligibility here. My intent is to make the middle class eligible.

Mr. FINGERHUT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully suggest that the gentleman is making the argument that he wishes to make, but is not addressing the specific language of the amendment that he puts before us on the table. The language before us on the table says that the Secretary shall ensure that the loans and loan guarantees go to these individuals. The gentleman wishes to make a general point. I understand his general point, but he has asked us to vote for an amendment that says it shall go to those people.

If the gentleman would respond to another question, I would be happy to yield to him. That is, the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] also raised, I think, what is a very important point, and that is, if we wish to vote for this amendment, if we share the gentleman's sentiments with respect to the individuals who have incomes between \$15,000 and \$85,000, and this is a program to be administered by the Secretary of Commerce, how does the gentleman believe, short of having every individual submit their income tax returns to the Secretary of Commerce for his perusal, how does the gentleman intend that the Secretary of Commerce will implement this section, should we all share his sentiment and choose to vote for it?

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINGERHUT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I assume that the people who are applying for the program will assure that they have established the eligibility requirements. That is what we do in all other programs. I assume that when they submit their application, that there will be a way of providing the information necessary to assure that they meet the eligibility requirements.

Mr. FINGERHUT. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, short of submitting their Federal income tax returns to the Secretary of Commerce, how else might that be done, I would ask the gentleman?

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, that might be one way that they could do that. There are affidavits. There are various kinds of ways. I personally release my income tax returns as part of my duties as a public official. It seems to me somebody who is applying for Government money and wants taxpayers' money might have to do that as part of this.

However, that is one way to assure that middle-class people, in fact, are included.

Mr. FINGERHUT. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, and I am happy to yield back, the gentleman also proposes in the language of this amendment, in addition to having to submit their income tax returns, that the company might be 51-percent owned or controlled by individuals.

In my experience, many companies that might be eligible for this program are owned by a number of individuals. Would it not be the case, I would ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that every person who is a part owner, up to the 51 percent level, would have to submit income tax returns to the Secretary of Commerce in order to demonstrate fitting under this amendment?

Mr. WALKER. Will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. FINGERHUT. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WALKER. Once again, the gentleman overstates the case. It seems to me he is trying to find ways for voting against the amendment. Why does the gentleman not just vote against the amendment?

It does not have to be everyone, just 51 percent of the people, Mr. Chairman. Fifty-one percent of the company has to be owned, so not everybody would have to submit it. A few people who are poor, a few who are rich, could be there, they would not have to be included in this.

□ 1110

You just would have to show 51 percent of the ownership was in the hands of the middle class, and I do not see anything there of great onerous burden.

Mr. FINGERHUT. Reclaiming my time, it says individuals whose adjusted gross income; what does the gentleman intend with respect to joint-filing couples? If they file jointly, would the husband and wife and their adjusted gross incomes, if it is over \$85,000, would that put them over the limit of the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT] has expired.

(On request of Mr. BECERRA, and by unanimous consent, Mr. FINGERHUT was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. FINGERHUT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman sees that it says those individuals, so if the gentleman wants to read it as closely as he is reading it in other regards, he might want to reflect upon the fact that it is individual tax returns that we are talking about.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of parts of this debate that I do not like. But let me say this: The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has been a staunch supporter of what we have begun to refer to as the middle class. I think his efforts are noble.

I want to make a few comments and say that it might sound unusual, but I am going to support the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER]. I think there are a lot of questions that have to be technically worked out, but at least the middle class, and the people that pay the taxes in America, are being addressed, maybe clumsily and without the type of construct necessary, but nevertheless addressed. And I want to give the gentleman credit for that.

But I want to talk about class here a minute. We have old and young, man and woman, black and white, and now we have rich and poor in America. The buzz word is taxing the rich. It is very easy to get trapped into this, Members of Congress.

I come from perhaps one of the most humble backgrounds of anybody in this House. My dad never worked for anybody who was poor. I do not like the discussion of class in this House. But we continue to get to it. We get to it on civil rights bills. We, Congress, are creating a class structure, stratified society in America that already does not need much of a helping hand.

I think just the opposite. We should be looking at other types of programs.

I want to say this: This is an amendment that probably should have been discussed much more, but I want to identify myself with the efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that not all Democrats disagree with him, and Democrats are not against the middle class. Democrats support the efforts of the middle-class taxpayers who pay the bills in America.

Now, if I look at his amendment, yes, we can go through all of the technical points that were brought out by my good friend and my colleague from Ohio, Mr. FINGERHUT. But while we provide all of these technicalities, sometimes we just use these technicalities to castrate and destroy opportunities too.

I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I did not find anything he attempted to do to be in any way inconsistent with the competitiveness bill. I commend him for taking a look at that, and if we are going to provide opportunities, maybe it is time that we remember the people who pay the bulk of the taxes. And hopefully, if this amendment is to any degree accepted or worked out, some of those clarifying points can be developed. If it is not, I do not want to stand here today in opposition to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, let me say I appreciate what the gentleman from Pennsylvania is trying to do, but I think this bill on an equity basis, on who can participate, does this very well. The gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA], in the legislation, has a provision that recognizes the importance of the role of minority and women-owned small businesses in the development of these high-technology programs, and a lot of these women-owned and minority-owned businesses, all of these folks are middle class. The provision of the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] would require the Secretary of Commerce to make available to the fullest extent possible at least 10 percent of the funding for this loan program to businesses owned or controlled by socially or economically disadvantaged individuals, including women.

Mr. Chairman, some of our colleagues have suggested that this is a social program or a set-aside, or most dangerously, a quota. This provision is none of these things: It is nothing more than an extension of current practice. The language represents a goal for the Department of Commerce, not a requirement, and has been successfully included in previous technology statutes in last year's National Energy Policy Act and in the fiscal year 1993 NASA appropriations bill.

To maintain our leadership position in the world, the United States must increase its efforts to diversify by ensuring that women and minorities play key roles in the transformation of our economy from cold war industries to the production of high-technology goods and services.

Two out of three workers in the year 2010 are going to be either minorities or women, two out of three of our American workers. We must strive to be inclusive, rather than exclusive, as we enter a future where minorities and women will play an increasingly prominent role.

Mr. Chairman, according to figures for fiscal year 1991 released by the National Association of Latino Elected Officials, the Federal Government has an anemic record of providing contracts to Hispanics under the section 8(a) requirements currently in place. In the Department of Commerce in fiscal year 1991, less than 2 percent of the department's total procurement went to Hispanic contractors—that's about \$10 million. Unfortunately, 1991 represents the high water mark. The average procurement contract spending by the Department of Commerce between fiscal years 1983 and 1991 amounts to only 1 percent of their total procurement spending.

If you consider all of the Federal agencies in fiscal year 1991, only \$1 billion or six-tenths of 1 percent of the Cabinet-level agencies total procurement dollars went to Hispanic firms.

Mr. Chairman, these numbers are appalling. I must admit that I am simply astounded by the lack of diversity that these figures represent.

I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] and the committee for adopting this language that is not quota language. It is in many of our previous statutes, and many of my colleagues should remember the debate we had on the Department of Defense procurement, a 10-percent goal amendment, not a quota. It was a goal that many times is not met, and it simply is an effort to include middle class, mainly minorities and women contractors, business people into the process.

So, Mr. Chairman, any attempts to strike or alter the language or dilute the language could jeopardize future attempts to ensure diversity in Federal programs.

What this bill is doing is just ensuring that diversity, protecting the middle class that I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] very rightly wants to protect. So I urge my colleagues to preserve fairness, inclusiveness and diversity in U.S. high-technology loan programs by voting against any provisions that dilute some of the good efforts that this committee has pursued and are in the legislation already.

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I too join in the effort to if not actually but symbolically support the middle class in our Nation, particularly with reference to this piece of legislation and the amendments thereto.

We are in the middle of celebrating Small Business Week. Some time in May is set aside every year to honor our small businessmen. What better way to pay tribute to what they do, creating two out of every three new jobs, the largest tax base that we have, the employee creation vehicle of our country, than to also help those people in the middle class who are sustained by small business and who sustain small business themselves. This is the kind of an amendment that will pay tribute not just to the economy that is driven by small business people, who happen to be in the middle class, but also to actually help them continue fomenting the jobs and the enterprise that creates the new economy upon which we are relying.

□ 1120

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEKAS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I ask the gentleman: I was sitting in my office and watching the debate and became more confused the more I listened and the more I watched.

Let me ask the gentleman—if I may, I would like to enter into a colloquy

with the gentleman—is it the gentleman's understanding now that the loans are available to anybody that applies regardless of income, regardless of disadvantage or any other reason?

Mr. GEKAS. That is true.

Mr. MARTINEZ. The loans now, as the bill stands, before this amendment, anybody is eligible to apply for the loan.

Mr. GEKAS. Seizing back my time just to answer the gentleman, what this does is place special emphasis on the middle-income class, not to exclude everybody else.

Mr. MARTINEZ. If the gentleman would, please, I am not talking about the amendment, I am talking about the bill before the amendment. Anybody can apply for a loan regardless of income.

Mr. GEKAS. What I am saying to the gentleman is, even if that were so, what this amendment does is to focus on the middle class and give special emphasis to the engineers of the economy, the middle class.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I would like to point out to the gentleman that I am aware of that. I point out that it says "\$85,000." Let me tell you, I was in business for 21 years, and I can tell you there were many years that I grossed more than \$85,000, but I did not net, as an income to myself, more than \$3,000 or \$4,000, after I met my tax obligation and everything else. So, what I am saying is this amendment is very restrictive. Right now the bill is that you can loan to anyone. Now, the only condition previously to this amendment was the Becerra amendment, which had a 10-percent set-aside, which was clearly defined, and has been clearly defined, in other legislation that we have had.

I ask the gentleman: Now we have two set-asides because, as I understand it, the Becerra amendment will stay in place but we will have a new amendment that restricts anybody above \$85,000 gross, \$85,000 gross, which I find is an attack against many middle income, and especially, let me describe to you, farmers who many times gross much more than that and yet they lose money on the crop that they have raised, because of the costs that it cost them did not meet what the market price was.

Mr. GEKAS. Seizing back my time, we believe this expands the notion of the bill and allows the middle class to participate in ways which before have been blocked out by the special references in the bill.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEKAS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania to expand and further respond.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is making a legitimate point that needs to be explained. When the bill

was eligible to everybody, there was no need for an amendment like this. But then we began to carve out special territories. And while the 10-percent set-aside was not a flat 10-percent set-aside, we decided in the antiquota amendment last evening, it still began to carve out territories for individuals, in this particular case, who were socially and economically disadvantaged. My point is, when we started down that road, it seems to me that then we ought to carve out a place for the middle class as well. If we are going to ensure that the Secretary takes a look at the socially and economically disadvantaged, this amendment does not stop that at all; but now we also say that he needs to ensure that the middle class is also included.

It seems to me that that is precisely what the gentleman from Pennsylvania is saying should be achieved. That is what I want to achieve, to make it certain. And to the gentleman's point about business returns and so on, the fact is it refers to individual returns. And so, you know, if an individual in terms of individual income only netted \$3,000, under this they would be covered by the Becerra amendment and so would the middle class.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GEKAS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GEKAS. I will yield to the gentleman from California first, and then to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. MARTINEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Now, it says "adjusted gross income for Federal income tax purposes." Small companies adjust their gross income when they pay their Federal income tax, but that income is adjusted from all the tax credits and everything else that he can apply to his business. But it is his business that is doing the income tax as well as he individually. I am telling you, if he grosses that amount, he does not necessarily get that amount.

Now, more than that, what we are doing here is restricting the ability of other people, people much larger than this, that may not be this high—these numbers are symbolic—but let me tell you numbers can work against you. We have to remember that. Numbers that are cited, in many cases, by the Federal Government in establishing criteria, all are not necessarily reflective of what the individual's wealth is.

Mr. GEKAS. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman is absolutely correct. Any set-aside does exactly the same thing, as the gentleman indicates. For purposes of policy, we have accepted certain types of set-asides. What we are

doing here, what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is trying to do, is to add the real bone marrow of our economy, the small business people in the middle class, in this special set-aside.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEKAS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. TRAFICANT, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GEKAS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEKAS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TRAFICANT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify a few issues. I am under the impression that the Walker amendment does not knock out section 336, and that the 10-percent set-aside for women and minorities is still in this bill.

Mr. GEKAS. That is correct.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Furthermore, let me say there are some questions on numbers brought up by the very intelligent question of Chairman MARTINEZ here. The bottom line is I see the intent to focus some direction to the smaller businesses, what we could call the middle income, middle class of American people. That is the intent.

Now, what I would like to say here is I am going to vote for this amendment; but when I do, I am a strong supporter of section 336, and I want it spread across the legislative history here that this amendment is in no way to threaten, endanger, or to stop the priority to minorities on set-asides necessary in the bill, and that is my point. And I would like an answer.

Mr. GEKAS. Reclaiming my time, we reemphasize that the Walker amendment supplements the ideas that have already been presented for the 10-percent set-aside.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman continue to yield?

Mr. GEKAS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman for yielding further.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to confirm that. This language in no way replaces the language that the Becerra amendment put in the bill. This is simply a recognition that the Secretary needs to look to the middle class as well.

Mr. GEKAS. And to the gentleman, I say again, if the \$85,000 worries you, that you netted only \$3,000, then that is exactly the kind of economics that we are trying to help here in the Walker amendment. That is the kind of individual who will need special attention because he is middle class and could require that kind of loan.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] has again expired.

(On request of Mr. MARTINEZ, and by unanimous consent, Mr. GEKAS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. GEKAS. I yield further to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MARTINEZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, the Becerra amendment is not restrictive in any way; it is voluntary, it is optional. The Secretary has the right to, and can, if he wants to, does not have to. But here again we have said, or this amendment sets, a very restrictive kind of imposition in that it says numbers, it has numbers, definite numbers; not as an optional thing but as a mandatory thing.

So, what I am saying to you, would it not be much better if it were open? The gentleman from Pennsylvania's last remarks about the reason he came about this amendment was because of carving aside for a particular group; now, look, that has been well established in a lot of legislation, that in previous awards of contracts, the consideration has never been given to those people, and I know the gentleman does not disagree with that. Would the gentleman not say it would be a lot better if we left the bill open with the 10-percent set-aside?

The one thing I would like to see as an amendment to the 10-percent set-aside is that those companies—because there are a lot of companies in my district that are not owned by minorities, but everybody who is employed there is a minority—so that minority consideration should be given to those companies that employ minorities, not just the companies that are owned by minorities.

Mr. GEKAS. Again reclaiming my time, the gentleman should be convinced, we are trying to convince him that nothing in the Walker amendment in any way derogates against the set-aside in the main body of the bill. So, the gentleman need not concern himself with that. The numbers that the gentleman talks about crowding to the middle class, were 90 percent of the new efforts in the business economy exist anyway, and that is what we are pump priming here with an emphasis on the Walker amendment.

□ 130

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEKAS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOKE. I think it is important to look at the amendment of Mr. BECERRA, section 336. The language there is that the Secretary shall—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GEKAS was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The Becerra amendment says the Secretary shall to the fullest extent possible insure—and it is not absolutely mandatory language, but it is awfully darn close to it.

The Walker amendment uses simply the language that the Secretary shall insure that.

The Becerra amendment goes quite a bit farther—shall to the fullest extent possible insure that at least.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEKAS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MARTINEZ. The gentleman is a little bit wrong there. I do not want to criticize, but it says the Secretary shall insure. It does not say what the gentleman just said. It says shall insure. That means absolutely that he will do this particular thing.

Mr. GEKAS. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is talking about the Walker amendment, that is shall insure.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I am saying that the Becerra amendment says the Secretary shall to the fullest extent possible insure.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I rise in opposition to the amendment. I hope not to use all that time.

I think I would like to make two points. The first is as the colloquy with my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FINGERHUT] showed, there is a noble intent behind this amendment, but the mechanics that are in the amendment are not easily workable. I think it needs to be more fleshed out.

But I think there is a larger point being missed. The whole point of this bill is that the middle class does qualify for these loans. The issue is that they qualify for all of them.

Hopefully, the bill is to encourage small- and medium-sized businesses, to give them access to capital. They have been frozen out. Venture capital has not been available, despite record low interest rates. They are included in the bill. The middle class can and will participate.

The best thing we can do for the middle class is make the investments in the kinds of technology and kinds of manufacturing jobs that will insure prosperity and a growing economy for all American citizens.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COPPERSMITH. I am honored to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MARTINEZ. There is one point I want to make, Mr. Chairman, and I did

not get a chance in the last colloquy; that is, there is a difference between the 10 percent set-aside and the Walker amendment.

The Walker amendment is restricting and disallowing a whole group of people that would be eligible to apply for these loans.

The Becerra amendment is not restrictive. It simply asks for special attention and consideration to be given to a group of people who always are having to come with lesser technology expertise than the larger companies to compete with those same companies. All we ask is that some special consideration be given. It is a precedent that has been set in law in almost everything we have done before. It was evident by the statements of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] that he came up with his amendment to actually diffuse the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA].

For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to vote against the Walker amendment.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman makes the first point, which is that the point of the Becerra amendment is to extend the reach of this bill to the middle class to make sure that all businesses, small- and medium-size, have access to this type of capital that they have been frozen out for.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COPPERSMITH. I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, because I think it is extraneous.

This bill, as drafted and before the House now being debated, not only contains 51 percent for the middle class, but 90 percent. So we have already arrived there.

We do not need any more bureaucracy, tangled paperwork, litmus tests for people bringing in their IRS statements and returns.

We have recognized that we need to beef up our competitiveness in this country. We want people to come forward, to be able to compete, understanding that there are those who are disadvantaged with the language of the Becerra amendment. The rest is for the people that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is referring to that we embrace, the middle class, those that even go beyond the middle class. We want them to come in and compete as well. We have 90 percent for all those people.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, I think 90 percent may understate it, because a number of the people that the Becerra amendment attempts to reach will be themselves middle class.

Ms. ESHOO. Absolutely.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. They will be businesses within the category.

Ms. ESHOO. Yes, we want to bring more and more people into the middle class.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I rise in opposition to the opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, like many of my colleagues, I share the concern of the gentleman from Pennsylvania about trying to find ways to make our Government a government of inclusion. To that extent, many of us have been working for years to try to bring about language in Federal programs that do just that, including to some extent our former President, Mr. Bush, who established a Commission on Minority Business Development 2 years ago, recognizing that our Nation's economic growth and ability to compete in the international marketplace depended on full participation of all members of our society.

Interestingly enough, Mr. Chairman, one of the primary recommendations of that Commission, and I have the report here with me, involved the need to include minority business enterprises in the area of high technology.

So the efforts of the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA] are right in tune with the recommendations of the Commission, a Commission put together by George Bush that made its report public last year, that many of us on both sides of the aisle adopted and said was the correct thing to do.

Having said that, let me go back to the point of the gentleman from New Mexico, who said and I think it is worth repeating that six-tenths of 1 percent of all procurement dollars through Federal agencies went to African-American or Latino businesses, six-tenths of 1 percent. That is in light of the Commission's report and recommendations. That is in light of previous existing set-aside programs and goals that have been a part of our Federal Government and our procurement process for well over a decade.

I need to also point out something that is very important here today that has not gotten a lot of attention. The Becerra language, the language of this amendment is a goal. It is a goal. It says that we shall to the fullest extent possible. It does not mandate anything. It goes back to the section 8(a) language that is a part of the Commission's recommendation that we have been using throughout our Federal Government for some time.

The Department of Defense uses that language in its set-aside program, which is a goal.

The Department of Energy uses that language in its set-aside program, which is a goal.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration uses that language, which is a goal.

I could go through agency by agency.

So we are not creating anything new. We are trying to extend to this Competitive Act and all these civilian technology programs the same sort of goals that the Commission recommended that we ought to be doing as a government to ensure full participation by all people.

Interestingly enough also, most of the people who benefit from this are in fact middle-class Americans. We found, however, that historically because of a pattern of discrimination in this Nation over decades that even middle-class people were being discriminated, not because they were middle class, but because they happened to be black or Latino or female.

So this Government, this Congress, and previous administrations, have set aside this goal language, the section 8(a) language which this amendment embraces.

So we are extending that. We are not creating anything new.

I would argue that we have to keep in mind that we are treading now on some very dangerous ground. Are we prepared to say to people who have been historically left out, economically and socially disadvantaged, and perhaps a better word is under-utilized businesses, that we are not prepared now to do what we have said we would do through recommendations and Commission reports and through a legislative history of doing just that.

Someone said earlier that this is Small Business Month and that we ought to do this in tribute. Let me say what we ought to do in tribute to small businesses. We ought to ensure that the playing field is equal and that it is even and that all people who are small businesses and are middle class have an opportunity to compete.

The gentleman from California raised a very important point. Using gross income as a determiner of the criteria creates an unreal situation. It does not take into account the circumstances that occur, and that an individual might have a gross of up to \$85,000 and nets only \$5,000 or \$10,000, we are back into a situation where we have to come back and rectify what we are doing.

□ 1140

What I am saying, Mr. Chairman, and I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] in just a moment, but what I am saying is that maybe we ought to keep things as they are. It is not working as well as we would like it to work because many of us still feel, based on the comments of the gentleman from New Mexico, that six-tenths of 1 percent of all procurement dollars to Latinos, and women, and African-Americans is not enough, but at least let us not change that to create a situation where we do more harm than we do good.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] has expired.

(On request of Mr. WALKER and by unanimous consent, Mr. MFUME was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MFUME. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] for yielding to me, and I just want to make a couple of points.

First of all, Mr. Chairman, it is not gross income in the amendment. It is adjusted gross income, which means that all business expenses are deducted before it is done, so we do deal with the problem that the gentleman from California had raised.

Second, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in this amendment that does not speak to Latino, and black, and other kinds of businessmen who are middle class. In fact, this helps in that regard because it does nothing to take away from the Berra amendment. The Berra amendment is still in place saying that they have to go to economically and socially disadvantaged, and then in addition what we are saying is, "You've got to take into account the middle class, and so what you've got then is a combination of those businesses, along with a demand from middle class participation, and it seems to me that it helps the very people that you say was cited in your report."

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I would submit to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] that the statement of the gentleman from California is correct, that the middle class is represented because those persons who have been historically underutilized, economically disadvantaged, and who are in business are middle class.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield just further, what this excludes is very, very wealthy people who could come into the process and be counted, for instance, into a category of maybe socially disadvantaged, but actually be very, very wealthy people. What we are saying is, "If you're going to do this, keep it within the middle class."

That is the only people that I can see will be excluded in this amendment is extremely wealthy people. I would say, "You could get money from the bank."

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I would submit that the report of the U.S. Commission on Minority Business Enterprise Development, which was commissioned by George Bush and released its recommendations last year which were accepted by this Congress, is right on track. It says that what we are doing is what we ought to be doing in terms of using 8(a) language for set-aside.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, this amendment does not in any way strike at

that. This amendment goes directly to the same points being made. It simply says the middle class should be taken into account.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, this amendment sets up a goal.

The CHAIRMAN. The additional time of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] has expired.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] be allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object, but I wish to point out, and I am reluctant to point out, that this is the first bill this year with an open rule. I am sadly fearing that this may give open rules a very bad name if we are not able to control our unconstrained appetite for unlimited debate over trivialities, and I am suggesting that it would be desirable if we can bring this to a vote.

I think I have given up, and I suspect the leadership has given up, on finishing this bill today. I am about to give up any idea of finishing it next week.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I have a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] has reserved a point of order.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I reserved the right to object in order to make this very eloquent statement, and I hope the Chair will recognize that I am within my rights for having done so.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Now, having made those points, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] is recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MFUME. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, No. 1, I tend to think that maybe open rules might be good around here, and maybe close the doors and not come out until we work our will rather than just putting through legislation which nobody reads and understands.

I want to make this point: I voted every time with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME], the distinguished chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus. I think he is an out-

standing leader. I just want to make one point before I get off. If I thought this would infringe upon that 10-percent set-aside, I would be against it. But let me say this:

What we have in the law now is tokenism. The reason we have six-tenths of 1 percent with all of this so-called 10-percent set-aside is the following words: "At least 10 percent of amounts loaned under this subtitle shall be made available," not "made to," but "available."

I say this to the House of Representatives today, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] will provide more grants to Latinos, blacks, and minorities with this in the bill than it will without it.

I want to know how many businesses between \$15,000 and \$85,000—my God, we have got people who cut grass with adjusted gross income in that range. These are the types of small businesses, the minority business men and women, that we want to, in fact, service.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] has expired.

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have an additional 2 minutes so that I might be able to respond to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MFUME was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman, first of all the gentleman is correct. He and I have voted together more times than either of us could even remember.

On this particular issue though, Mr. Chairman, let me offer something for his consideration. His point that the Walker amendment would enhance the ability of African-Americans, and Latinos, and women to do business with the Government begs the question: How can that take place when this amendment is a goal? The Berra amendment is a goal. Neither of them mandate, and so a goal on top of a goal does not enhance anything. It just simply makes what we are trying to do much more cumbersome.

Mr. Chairman, these are goals. These are not set-asides.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MFUME. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TRAFICANT. "The Secretary shall ensure," not "make available," "that loan guarantees made available under the subtitle are made to," not "made available," "are made to business concerns which are at least 51 percent owned or controlled by middle-class Americans"—No. 1, they have to be an American, too, in the Walker amendment, which is good—as defined as those individuals—and the point I want to make—

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. TRAFICANT. What Walker says is that that Secretary has to ensure between 50 and 85 gross adjusted income. Those are the people that we have been with tokens trying to help around here with six-tenths of 1 percent.

Mr. MFUME. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, what the language is saying is that the Secretary shall to the fullest extent possible, and, over the last 15 years in this country, never has the fullest extent possible equaled what we were trying to do. So, it does not ensure that, and we have to be very careful of that, and there is a legislative history that proves it.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MFUME. I will not yield. I only have a little bit of time left.

Let me say this: I appreciate the position of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] on this. I would just respond, as it relates to this whole idea about open rules, that we ought to have more of them around here so we can do what we ought to do in this place, and that is to have active debate on issues regardless of what side of the aisle we are on, and, if it takes us until hell freezes over, then so be it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] has expired.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment may not seem objectionable at first glance, but placed in the context of language already in the bill, it makes a mockery of attempts to provide fair treatment to minorities.

The Walker amendment would undermine a provision in the bill, included at committee markup, which calls on the Commerce Secretary, to the best extent possible, to ensure that 10 percent of the funds made available under the Civilian Technology Loan Program, go to socially and economically disadvantaged individuals.

This original language establishes a reasonable goal, nothing more. It does not impose a quota. It does not provide for sanctions if that goal is not met. It simply says that the Secretary shall try to ensure that minorities and women, who are routinely left out of the process due to intentional or inadvertent discrimination, be included in the loan program.

The Walker amendment undermines the spirit of the minority goals in the bill by expanding the language to include a business owned by any individual who earns up to \$85,000 a year. Are people making \$85,000 frequently denied the opportunity to participate in Federal programs? Do people making \$85,000 a year have a history of discrimination and disenfranchisement? Contrary to what the Walker amendment tells us, the answer clearly is no.

Mr. Chairman, we should not let the thoughtful language included in the bill to protect minority participation in the loan program be compromised by the Walker amendment. I ask my colleagues to not be fooled by the Walker amendment and to reject it outright.

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment offered by my friend from Ohio. I know he wants to craft the best possible bill, but I disagree with his analysis and must oppose this amendment.

I believe the facts show the usefulness and need for large-scale consortia. First, opponents of the provision claim that the administration has not made a specific budget request for large-scale consortia in either the fiscal year 1994 budget or the fiscal year 1995 projections, supposedly indicating a lack of support. However, the amounts authorized for the large-scale consortia are a subsection of the total amount authorized for the ATP Program. The administration projects requesting \$460 million in fiscal year 1995 for ATP, and this bill's total ATP authorization actually represents spending of \$100 million below that projected request. Section 322 provides program direction for part of the overall ATP Program, a program strongly supported by the administration and specifically endorsed in both the Clinton-Gore technology policy and the vision of change of America that accompanied the President's State of the Union Address.

Also, section 322 does not restrict unnecessarily the ATP Program. This bill does not require establishment of large-scale consortia; it simply gives preference for such consortia for a \$100 million portion of the fiscal year 1994 funds for ATP. If the National Institute of Standards and Technology [NIST] does not receive any large-scale consortia proposals worth funding, it can simply award the funds in the same way as other ATP money. The \$50 million Federal share size is not binding, but rather a guide, and NIST could choose to fund a consortium at any smaller size as well.

I also believe the facts do not support the criticism of Sematech, one of the principal models for the ATP Program. Critics have claimed a variety of failures for Sematech, principally betting on losing technologies and unfairness to small business. While everyone can agree that Sematech has had some difficulties, as anyone would expect with such a new type of cooperative effort, I think the critics focus narrowly and incorrectly on certain technologies and overlook the broader contributions Sematech has made to the recovery of the U.S. semiconductor industry, particularly in the semiconductor manufacturing equipment sector. The equipment and processes Sematech has helped develop and improve apply not just in the manufacture of D-RAMS or any other one set of technologies, but rather have helped a much wider range of semiconductor manufacturing, including microprocessor manufacturing.

Recent developments in the U.S. semiconductor industry that rely on Sematech developments provide concrete proof of success. Intel Corp. reports that as a result of Sematech's contribution to the equipment industry, last year Intel spent \$150 million more than it had anticipated on U.S. semiconductor manufacturing equipment. Similarly, when Mo-

torola opened its MOS-11 microcontroller production facility in Austin TX, 2 years ago, Sematech's success enabled the company to buy over 75 percent of the equipment from U.S. companies; in Motorola's prior facility, 80 percent of the equipment came from foreign firms. Just last month, Motorola announced plans to open a similar microcontroller production facility MOS-12, in Chandler, AZ, in my district. This plant will eventually provide 700 Arizona jobs. Motorola attributes its ability to purchase more American equipment as well as this expansion in large part to the success of Sematech in increasing the competitiveness of the U.S. semiconductor industry. We should look at the increased sales and the new jobs created for American workers, rather than dry academic studies of the consortium's flaws, to judge the success of Sematech.

The actual experience of Sematech also refutes the argument that large-scale consortia exclude small business. While the 14 members of Sematech are large firms, by no means do large firms receive all the funding. A 1992 GAO report on Sematech noted that in 1991, 48 percent of the Sematech budget supported external R&D. Many small- or medium-sized companies have received this external funding. In addition, the GAO report noted that Sematech has become the focal point for "... improving long-term relationships between semiconductor manufacturers and their key equipment and materials suppliers through the Partnering for Total Quality Program. This program works directly with SemiSematech, a 130-member organization of U.S. semiconductor manufacturing equipment manufacturers and component and materials suppliers, to encourage communication between primary semiconductor manufacturers and the related equipment suppliers. Most of the firms in SemiSematech are small- or medium-sized companies. The success of small business in no small measure depends on the health of the leading companies in our most important industries. Without the larger buyers, small high-technology businesses have no customers.

Some of my colleagues also have questioned whether small businesses participate effectively in another consortium, the U.S. Advanced Battery Consortium [USABC], sponsored by the Department of Energy, the "Big Three" auto manufacturers, and the electric utility industry. As with Sematech, small businesses do participate in the consortium's research efforts as contractors. In fact, the first contract awarded by the USABC went to a small business, Ovonic Battery Company of Troy, MI. The \$18.5 million awarded under that contract represents over 20 percent of the budget for the 4 major contracts awarded through the consortium. In addition, just as small businesses realized much of the benefit of Sematech work by supplying equipment to primary semiconductor manufacturers, small businesses supplying components to battery manufacturers will reap much of the benefit from the Battery Consortium's work.

Finally, the GAO study of Sematech stressed that research consortia should support projects likely to have effect throughout the industry. When we try to improve the competitiveness of entire industries, it makes no sense to exclude the largest firms, the leaders

in those industries. It does make sense to encourage cooperation among both the large firms, who can contribute the substantial resources and expertise needed to address industrywide problems, and smaller firms, who often contribute greater innovation and flexibility.

Sematech has achieved considerable success in fostering such cooperation and has the results to show. I hope that future consortia will build on that experiment with even more successful outcomes. Unfortunately, this amendment will prevent us from achieving the goals of this legislation, and I must urge my colleagues to vote against it.

□ 1150

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 231, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 162]

AYES—181

Allard	Gallo	McCandless
Applegate	Gekas	McCollum
Archer	Gilchrest	McCrery
Armey	Gillmor	McHugh
Bachus (AL)	Gilman	McInnis
Baker (CA)	Gingrich	McKeon
Baker (LA)	Goodlatte	McMillan
Ballenger	Goodling	Meyers
Barrett (NE)	Goss	Mica
Bartlett	Grams	Michel
Bateman	Grandy	Miller (FL)
Bentley	Greenwood	Mollinari
Bereuter	Gunderson	Moorhead
Bilbray	Hall (TX)	Myers
Bilirakis	Hancock	Nussle
Bliley	Hansen	Packard
Blute	Hastert	Parker
Boehner	Hefley	Paxon
Bonilla	Herger	Penny
Bunning	Hobson	Peterson (MN)
Burton	Hoekstra	Petri
Buyer	Hoke	Pombo
Callahan	Horn	Porter
Calvert	Houghton	Portman
Camp	Huffington	Pryce (OH)
Canady	Hunter	Quillen
Castle	Hutchinson	Quinn
Clinger	Hutto	Ramstad
Coble	Hyde	Ravenel
Collins (GA)	Inglis	Regula
Combest	Inhofe	Ridge
Condit	Istook	Roberts
Cox	Jacobs	Rogers
Crane	Johnson (CT)	Rohrabacher
Crapo	Johnson (SD)	Roth
Cunningham	Johnson, Sam	Roukema
DeLay	Kasich	Rowland
Dickey	Kim	Royce
Doolittle	Kling	Santorum
Dornan	Kingston	Saxton
Dreier	Klug	Schaefer
Duncan	Knollenberg	Schiff
Dunn	Kolbe	Sensenbrenner
Emerson	Kyl	Shaw
Everett	Lazio	Shays
Ewing	Levy	Shuster
Fawell	Lewis (CA)	Skeen
Fields (TX)	Lewis (FL)	Skelton
Fish	Lightfoot	Smith (MI)
Fowler	Linder	Smith (NJ)
Franks (CT)	Lipinski	Smith (OR)
Franks (NJ)	Machtley	Smith (TX)

Snowe
Solomon
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Stump
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (MS)

Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Traficant
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon

Whitten
Williams
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

McDade
Murphy
Neal (NC)
Reed
Romero-Barcelo
(PR)

Sarpalius
Spence
Stupak
Tanner
Tauzin
Torkildsen

Torricelli
Tucker
Wise

□ 1211

Mr. OWENS, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mr. MENENDEZ changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. McMILLAN and Mr. ROYCE changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, during roll-call vote No. 162, on H.R. 820, the Walker amendment, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present I would have voted no.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there other amendments to title III?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY Mr. VALENTINE

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VALENTINE: Page 52, line 23, strike "shall" and insert in lieu thereof "may".

Page 53, line 20, strike "\$50,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$30,000,000".

Page 55, after line 15, insert the following new subsections:

(f) STUDY.—The Secretary, through the Director, shall undertake a study to determine the best way to maximize the benefit of large-scale research and development consortia to industry as a whole in carrying out this section. The results of such study shall be submitted to the Congress within 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act. Such report shall include criteria and procedures for the evaluation by the Director of the progress of consortia funded under this section.

(g) TERMINATION.—The Secretary shall establish criteria and procedures for terminating Federal funding of a consortium under this section if the Secretary determines that such consortium is not making acceptable progress toward achieving its goals. No consortium shall receive funding under this section for more than 7 years.

Page 55, line 16, strike "(f)" and insert in lieu thereof "(h)".

Mr. VALENTINE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, as part of the Advanced Technology Program, large-scale R&D consortia will have the ability to benefit an entire industry or to benefit several industries. Large-scale consortia will benefit many suppliers, manufacturers, and users—small, medium, and large. Large-scale consortia will bring together the variety of skills and resources increasingly needed to advance the technological frontier. Large-scale consortia will give significant leverage to each dollar that the firms invest.

NOES—231

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Berman
Bevill
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehlt
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gedden
Gephardt

Geren
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies
Mezvisky
Markay
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHaile
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Natcher

Neal (MA)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pickle
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sawyer
Schen
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Strickland
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Towns
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Wilson
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOT VOTING—25

Barton
Brown (OH)
de la Garza
Dellums

Faleomavaega
(AS)
Gallegly
Henry

Leach
Lehman
Livingston
Manzullo

It should be made clear that large-scale consortia are not all imitations of Sematech, although Sematech has provided many valuable lessons on how such consortia can best contribute to industry. Large-scale consortia will likely take many different forms, reflecting the variety of industries in our economy.

The amendment that I am offering would accomplish the following:

First, it would direct the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a 6 month study of how this program can best be implemented to provide maximum benefit to industry.

Second, it would give the Secretary the discretion to implement this program based on the study and other criteria that the Secretary deems appropriate.

Third, it would direct the Secretary to establish criteria for evaluating the progress of consortia, and, if necessary, terminating consortia that are not making acceptable progress.

Fourth, and it would lower the threshold for government support from \$50 to \$30 million. We want these consortia to have broad impact in high tech industries, which is why we have established a preference for a threshold. A lower threshold would, again, give the Secretary more flexibility.

I believe that this is an important provision and that these modifications will improve its implementation in an effective and responsible way.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to comment that there is really no objection from this side of the aisle to this particular amendment, except for the fact that it really does not get to the heart of the problem with section 322 with respect to large-scale research and development consortia.

I do not urge my colleagues to vote for or against it. I think we ought to go to a vote, and we will follow this amendment with another amendment to strike the entire section.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise in strong support of the Valentine amendment to section 322 on the subject of large-scale R&D consortia.

Before I speak to it, I want to say a word about our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE], who was just speaking.

He has made an enormous contribution to the debate in our subcommittee and in the full committee on consortia. He is an expert in the field. He is concerned that some R&D consortia have been ineffective, and I agree with him. And I know that his contribution later today will be valuable.

But I must say that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE], our subcommittee chairman, in my mind, wins the day with this amendment, which would make the implementation of large-scale R&D consortia discretionary with the Secretary of Commerce.

We must be able to permit Sematech and even better versions of R&D consortia to be formed in this country, whether they be small scale, medium, or large scale, because the future, in my view, of our competitiveness in the world depends on the ability of our industry to combine together to make cutting-edge advances in technology.

This amendment would direct the Secretary of Commerce to conduct a 6-month study of ways to best implement the program, to maximize the benefits to industry as a whole.

And let me stress that there would be a study so that we would not be wasting money. It would clarify termination, that a consortium would not receive Federal funds beyond a maximum life of 7 years. It would reduce the preferred threshold level for the Government cost share in a large-scale R&D consortium from \$50 to \$30 million. And this would give the Secretary greater discretion and reflects a greater range of proposals and programs from industry, such as the Advanced Battery Consortium and the American Textile Consortium.

Remember, this is not a cap on contributions. A cap is opposed because it reduces the potential incentives of industry. Several industry consortia have been proposed that are on a scale of Sematech, and there should be discretion to evaluate these on their merits.

In conclusion, let me say that there is bipartisan interest in our subcommittee and full committee on this issue, and I would commend our Republican colleagues, especially the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] for the contribution he has made to this debate.

□ 1220

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would think it would be highly unfortunate that on this very excellent amendment, which is fully agreed to on both sides, we would not have some extensive debate. Therefore, I am taking this time in order to give a portion of that debate in the hope that other Members will be inspired to get in and we can take up another hour or two on this totally agreed to, non-controversial amendment.

Let me say, first of all, that I share the feelings of the gentlewoman from California [Ms. HARMAN] who just spoke about the importance of subjecting large scale consortia to considerable analysis. We have been trying to stay on top of the problems of consortia in our committee now for several years. We have held hearings on Sematech and other similar types of consortia in an effort to evolve rules which will lead us to be able to judge how effective these are.

I think we are making good progress on that, and it is my view that the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE], which lays upon the department a duty to continue this kind of analysis, actually is something that they probably should be doing in any event, as we seek to evolve a more effective way of relating to some of the problems of industry.

I think probably some of the Members already know, and I am sure that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] and others who studied this know that Sematech, which was initiated by the Reagan administration in an effort to be of assistance to the semiconductor industry, was flawed in a number of ways, which were pointed out in some of the hearings that we had.

We want to correct those flaws. We want to make the system work. We think it is appropriate that industry should be able to form the kind of consortia which will benefit industry and that government's role should be to respond to the legitimate interests of industry to the fullest extent that they can. I think this amendment will do that.

I apologize if I have belabored this unnecessarily, but I am hopeful that a message will emanate from my remarks that we should not belabor non-controversial amendments too much.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. HOKE

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer two amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. Hoke:

Page 52, line 20, through page 55, line 20, strike section 322.

Page 55, line 21, redesignate section 323 as section 322.

Page 3, amend the table of contents by striking the item relating to section 322; and by striking "Sec. 323." and inserting in lieu thereof "Sec. 322."

Page 124, lines 13 through 15, strike "of which" and all that follows through "322 of this Act, and".

Mr. HOKE (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOKE. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, we have information as to one amend-

ment. I would ask the gentleman, do we have copies of both of the amendments?

Mr. HOKE. I would say to the gentleman, I believe he has a copy of both amendments. One is the authorizing language that goes to title 5 of the bill.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, these amendments represent one of the easiest spending cut votes that Members will be able to cast this year. My amendment strikes section 322 of H.R. 820, permitting the Commerce Department to set up new large-scale technology research and development consortia in partnership with industry.

The authors of this section have authorized \$100 million in fiscal year 1995 to begin the effort, but they have also included language in section 322 which mandates a minimum Federal commitment of no less than \$30 million to each of the select consortia, and allows the Government to continue funding at that level for up to 7 years.

Assuming that the Commerce Department elects to fund only one consortium and the Senate does not limit the number, this part of H.R. 820 alone could make the taxpayers liable for as much as an additional \$210 million.

Mr. Chairman, I think, instead of beginning with my own arguments about the section 322, we really ought to see how little support it has, both within the committee itself, the subcommittee itself, as well as from the administration, because the fact is that we just passed by voice vote an amendment which significantly changes the language and the mandate that goes to the Secretary of Commerce. We have changed the language that "the director shall establish a program" to saying that "the director may establish a program."

Why have we done that? We have done that because my friends on the other side of the aisle recognize that the administration is not really asking for this amendment to be passed. They do not want section 322 as part of this bill, and that was why the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE] offered his earlier amendment which was just passed.

Why is it that the administration is not in favor of making this a priority of their economic program at this time? I will tell the Members why. The fact is that these kinds of consortia just do not work very well. If the Members try to find a line item in the Clinton budget for the establishment of a large-scale technology R&D consortia, they will not find it. They will find one that was proposed for an environmentally clean automobile, they have proposed one for a fiber optic information highway, they have proposed one for the Energy Department's national laboratories, but they have not proposed one for section 322.

This invitation to enlarge government did not tempt the administration. Let me cite the arguments of industry with respect to this. None of the witnesses who came before the Subcommittee on Technology, Environment and Aviation of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology in hearings this year chose to testify explicitly on behalf of section 322. Not even the chairman of Sematech, who presides over the largest government-industry consortium, mentioned section 322 in his February 17 testimony before the Subcommittee on Technology, Environment and Aviation.

Therefore, although I am offering the amendment, I would suggest that the members do not have to listen to me about it at all, that they would do better to listen to the authors of 322 themselves as they chip away progressively at their own language; listen to the Clinton administration as it speaks loudly with silence with respect to it, clearly not making it a priority; and listen to industry as it says nothing about a section that was supposedly designed to help the private sector.

If we listen long enough we come up with one more question: Why should Congress invite the Commerce Department to add another \$200 million to the deficit, only for an unwanted, nonexistent program that will assist none of our constituents, at least for the next fiscal year and probably beyond.

Mr. Chairman, none of these developments should surprise us, because innovations in U.S. technology have never occurred primarily through Government patronage. They have occurred through imaginative companies responding to market changes. This fact even applies to Japan, and it does not apply only in Japan, it applies everywhere that markets exist.

According to a study that was done by a scholar at the American Enterprise Institute, the Japanese industries that have encountered the greatest success over the past 30 years—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] has expired.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 3 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I do not know that I will object, but I would beg the gentleman and the Members on the other side to cooperate with us. This is not altogether an open rule. We call it an open rule, but this is a rule on perpetuity.

Everybody here can get 5 minutes, every Member. Therefore, I suggest that to go beyond that seems to be taking a lot for granted Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, we do not need section 322. The most inefficient sectors of the Japanese economy, the steel, the oil, the rail, the telephone industries, have all struggled under heavy public subsidization or outright ownership. The greatest successes that the Japanese have encountered have not been in any of those areas that have been subsidized that way.

Mr. Chairman, we do not need this section. We cannot afford this section. The Clinton administration does not want this section. If 820 is going to become law, let us at least place it on the President's desk without a section like this, one which simply adds weight instead of substance to the bill.

The last observation that I would like to make is that we are nibbling around the edges so much with something like this. If we really wanted to make a difference, in 1993 the capital gains tax in this country will actually raise \$34 billion. By eliminating the capital gains tax, that would put \$34 billion back into the hands of people who would make exactly the kinds of investments we are suggesting here, much better in the private sector than through the public sector.

□ 1230

Finally, I would like to thank very much the gentlewoman from California for her kind comments.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, while I have tried hard to work with the gentleman to accommodate his concerns with large scale consortia, we have a fundamental difference of opinion concerning whether or not the Department of Commerce should be involved in large scale efforts with U.S. industry.

U.S. industry faces unprecedented, costly, Government-aided challenges in many technological fields. Europe and Japan have poured resources into a wide variety of initiatives, some of which have borne fruit and some of which have not. We have successfully met some of these challenges, usually through the Department of Defense. Sematech, despite what our Republican colleagues may say, has been credited by the Semiconductor Industry Association and the Semiconductor Equipment Manufacturers International [SEMI] as a major contributor to the turnaround of both of these industries. Before Sematech was proposed by industry to government, many of our major chipmakers were on the ropes and equipment manufacturers were going out of business right and left. Now that the results of Sematech are being felt, companies like Intel and AMD had record profits in 1992. Intel was able to buy 80 percent domestic

equipment for its last fab; a few years ago that figure was 20 percent. Sematech's concentration on assuring strong suppliers to the semiconductor industry is a major success story.

Another widely misunderstood victory for large-scale U.S. Government-industry cooperation is high definition systems. This is a topic we championed in the late 1980's in our committee when it became obvious that digital electronics was making an opening for our companies. While the furor over industrial policy was occurring, Darpa quietly spent \$200 million to make these concepts a reality. Yes, U.S. Government funds played a big role in our resurgence in this field. Darpa now is investing hundreds of millions of dollars in other largely civilian technologies including flat panel displays and x-ray lithography.

The purpose of the provision Mr. Hoke tries to limit is to provide a civilian alternative for the Government role in these programs. We badly need a civilian technology agency which can infuse civilian values into these efforts and which can cooperate with Darpa when the projects like Sematech have major civilian and defense consequences. Setting an artificial cap of \$50 million ignores the reality that U.S. efforts to gain a position in the industries of the future are expensive. Most of the major consortia which have begun in the last several years both here and abroad cost well over \$50 million per year.

Voting for the Hoke amendment is saying, yes we do want to complete, but first let us tie one hand behind our backs so we don't compete very well. My colleagues, the time when we could win economically with a second-class effort is long gone. Defeat the Hoke amendment so we can get on with the job of keeping America a great manufacturing nation.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have now heard it described that the reason why we ought to do these large-scale consortia that the gentleman from Ohio wants to strike is because of the success of Sematech, that Sematech has been this huge success, and if we only would replicate that over and over again we would be able to get U.S. competitiveness back into the realm of world competition. Well, I think we better again raise a few questions about that. We raised some questions in the committee about whether or not Sematech had really been successful in their promotion of D-RAM technology.

But let us look at some more recent information about what is really happening over there and decide whether or not Sematech or this bill has anything to do with reality. Sematech, prior to its current leadership, withheld state-of-the-art semiconductor manufacturing equipment from those

people who were not members. This tended to hurt the small semiconductor manufacturers. So the small guys out there were basically being shoved aside by Sematech, and so small American manufacturers were being disadvantaged.

Members want to know why just a few minutes ago we tried to get middle-class small business included. It is because concerns like Sematech have been purposely excluding them.

And then what we find is Sematech also began to lose membership, and most recently one of the single largest recipients of a Sematech funding, GCA, which is a lithography company, went up for sale, and it is conceivable, in fact, press reports indicate that it is reality that the buyer of GCA that has gotten all of this taxpayer money is going to go to a foreign company. What that means is that Sematech is now out looking for some other kind of lithography equipment, and guess who they signed up with? Canon, which is Japan's largest manufacturer of lithography equipment.

If that is the case, if Sematech, this great success story, is now going to the Japanese to get what they need, the fact is that under our bill they would not be able to do that. Our bill has excluded people from allowing them to make those kinds of deals, and so if our bill is supposed to replicate Sematech, we have already destroyed that which Sematech is finding they are having to do in order to be successful.

This tells you something about the fact that if we are truly going to save American technology with this kind of stuff, we are not going to get there with this bill. And certainly the Sematech experience also leaves something to be desired.

Then let me point out one other thing we just learned yesterday. It turns out that the Hampshire Co. of New York, which is a joint venture partner with McDonnell Douglas, and received a first-round ATP program award of a little over \$1 million, well, sorry folks, our record of picking winners does not look very good. They went belly-up. When we checked yesterday, the Hampshire Co. NIST said they have closed. They are no longer open. They think that some other company is going to take over the work done by this joint venture, but sorry about that, we did not pick very well. I mean, I think it is nice if someone is going to take over the work, but the fact of the matter is the taxpayer has invested money in this failed venture, and may not get any return whatsoever on the investment we made. This is 1 failure out of the first 10 ATP grants awarded in the first round in 1991.

Proponents of the bill are saying well, we expect some failures. That may be. But when we talk about large-scale consortia like is being talked about in this particular bill, what we

are talking about is millions of dollars being invested in one firm, and it should give us all pause.

Let us go back to the GCA that is selling out. We find out that the president of Sematech said they put \$30 million into that venture, and it turns out that the electronic news publication, one of the most respected publications in the business, said it spent a lot more than that, and the Member of Congress who represents that district has estimated that it may have been as high as \$90 million that went into that one firm, one firm, \$90 million, boom, went under. We do not know. We are going to have to go out and make deals with the Japanese, and what are we doing? We find out that the first round of ATP grants has at least one, 10 percent of them that are already under and not likely to be revived.

Picking winners and losers in business is not something we ought to be doing. The gentleman from Ohio is absolutely right. The best way to get U.S. competitiveness is to get the Government out of this business and assure that the markets pick the winners and the losers. They will do as good a job if not a better job than what Sematech has shown up until now.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words. I have several comments. First, I rise in opposition, sadly, to the Hoke amendment. I had hoped that by the offering of the immediate last amendment we would have been done with this issue, because the last amendment, as we all know, makes the grants to consortia discretionary with the Secretary of Commerce.

□ 1240

I believe that that is the right accommodation of the point of view just offered that some of these consortia may not be successful.

But at any rate, some comments have just been made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania about Sematech which I believe are inaccurate, and I would like to put the facts before us. It is not the case that the lithography technology was sold to Canon, a Japanese company. Canon has licensed Sematech's technology, and the license is with the Silicon Valley group which was not a large-scale company and was about to go bankrupt until Sematech was able to help it.

We could debate for hours the successes of each individual consortium, but there certainly are many in this country that are successful.

What I would like to suggest is that it is not just a question of the success of U.S. consortia, because, remember, for the future, the approval of any of these will be discretionary, but it is also the fact that a lot of the competitive enterprises overseas in Europe and Japan have been developed by means of consortia.

If the United States wants to compete effectively in the world market, we have to be able to do what our European and Japanese competitors can do, and let me just offer some facts: Over the period 1984-93, the governments of the European Community will spend about \$25 billion on R&D consortia, on technologies that include telecommunications and computers, industrial technologies, enabling technologies, advanced materials and biotechnology, and in addition, over the past 30 years, the Japanese Government has supported over 30 consortia.

I would offer again the point that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE] would eliminate the opportunity for our Government to fund or to cost-share the large-scale consortia necessary to make us competitive in the global marketplace.

I reluctantly oppose it because I had hoped this whole committee, on a bipartisan basis, would come to agreement on this issue.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HOKE].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 234 not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 163]

AYES—176

Allard	Duncan	Johnson (CT)
Applegate	Dunn	Johnson, Sam
Archer	Emerson	Kasich
Armey	Everett	Kim
Bachus (AL)	Ewing	King
Baker (CA)	Fawell	Kingston
Baker (LA)	Fields (TX)	Klug
Ballenger	Fish	Knollenberg
Barrett (NE)	Fowler	Kolbe
Bartlett	Franks (CT)	Kyl
Barton	Franks (NJ)	Lazio
Bereuter	Gallo	Levy
Bilirakis	Gekas	Lewis (CA)
Bliley	Gilchrest	Lewis (FL)
Blute	Gillmor	Lightfoot
Boehner	Gilman	Linder
Bonilla	Gingrich	Livingston
Bunning	Goodlatte	Machtley
Burton	Goodling	McCandless
Buyer	Goss	McCollum
Callahan	Grams	McCrery
Calvert	Grandy	McDade
Camp	Greenwood	McHugh
Canady	Gunderson	McInnis
Castle	Hancock	McKeon
Clement	Hansen	McMillan
Clinger	Hastert	Meyers
Coble	Hefley	Mica
Collins (GA)	Herger	Michel
Combest	Hoagland	Miller (FL)
Condit	Hobson	Molinar
Cox	Hoekstra	Moorhead
Crane	Hoke	Morella
Crapo	Horn	Myers
Cunningham	Houghton	Nussle
Darden	Hunter	Oxley
DeLay	Hutchinson	Packard
Diaz-Balart	Hyde	Paxon
Dickey	Inglis	Penny
Doolittle	Inhofe	Peterson (MN)
Dornan	Istook	Petri
Dreier	Jacobs	Pombo

Porter
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Quillen
Quinn
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Ridge
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum

Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stenholm

Stamp
Sundquist
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zimmer

Whitten
Williams
Wise

Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn

Yates

NOT VOTING—27

Bateman	Hoyer	Sarpalilus
Bryant	Huffington	Slattery
Clay	Leach	Stupak
de la Garza	Lehman	Tanner
Dellums	Manzullo	Torricelli
Faleomavaega	Murphy	Towns
(AS)	Neal (NC)	Tucker
Gallegly	Romero-Barcelo	Wilson
Gephardt	(PR)	Zeliff
Henry	Rose	

□ 1303

Ms. CANTWELL and Ms. BROWN of Florida changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut changed her vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendments were rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE DEADLINE

(By unanimous consent, Mr. McDERMOTT was allowed to speak out of order for 1 minute.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to remind Members and senior staff that financial disclosure statements must be filed with the Office of Records and Registration by the close of business on Monday, May 17. That is this coming Monday.

If you have any questions regarding financial disclosure matters the staff of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is available to answer them at 57103 or 53787.

Any request for extension of the filing deadline must be received by the committee prior to close of business on May 17.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GORDON) having assumed the chair, Mr. LANCASTER, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 820) to amend the Stevenson-Wylder Technology Innovation Act of 1980 to enhance manufacturing technology development and transfer, to authorize appropriations for the Technology Administration of the Department of Commerce, including the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent when the House cast votes 162 and 163 as I was attending a regional hearing and site visit of the Base Closure and Realignment Commission in Michigan.

These hearings relate to the potential closure of K.I. Sawyer Air Force Base, a matter of utmost concern to

NOES—234

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Bacchus (FL)
Baesler
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Boehner
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Byrne
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clayton
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
De Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Derrick
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English (AZ)
English (OK)
Eshoo
Evans
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Frost
Furse
Gedensson
Geren

Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hastings
Hayes
Hefner
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolles
Mezvinisky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCloskey
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Murtha

Nadler
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Norton (DC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (FL)
Pickett
Pickles
Pomeroy
Poshard
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reynolds
Richardson
Roemer
Rostenkowski
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Sawyer
Schenk
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Serrano
Sharp
Shepherd
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Spratt
Stark
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda
Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Traffant
Underwood (GU)
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volker
Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat

Michigan's First Congressional District. If I had been present, I would have voted "nay" on votes 162 and 163.

REPORT ON H.R. 2118, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR ENDING SEPTEMBER 30, 1993

Mr. NATCHER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-91) on the bill (H.R. 2118) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GALLO reserved all points of order on the bill.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to engage the gentleman from Maryland in a colloquy about the schedule for the remainder of the day and perhaps even next week, and I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I would say that we have finished our business for today. We expect no further votes today. That is assuming we do not have an adjournment vote or something of that nature.

Mr. SOLOMON. We will try to see to that.

Mr. HOYER. We do not have any scheduled votes.

There will be no legislative business on Monday.

We will go in Tuesday at noon and we will have three suspensions:

H.R. 2034, Veterans' Health Programs Amendments of 1993;

H.R. 1934, Federal Maritime Commission Reauthorization; and

H.R. 1189, Armored Car Industry Reciprocity Act.

On Wednesday, May 19, and the balance of the week we will have consideration of the National Competitiveness Act, hopefully to complete consideration of that bill which has been on the floor today.

Then H.R. 1159, the Passenger Vessel Safety Act, which will be subject to a rule, of course. Then we will take up the fiscal year 1993 General Supplemental Appropriations bill.

We will then have a resolution (S.J. Res. 45) which will authorize United States forces in Somalia.

Then last, H.R. 873, the Gallatin Range Consolidation and Protection Act, which was a suspension we previously had on the floor.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, if I might just ask the gentleman, there are no votes on Monday, and there are three suspensions on Tuesday?

Mr. HOYER. That is correct.

Mr. SOLOMON. What is the likelihood of votes on Tuesday, and how early might they come?

Mr. HOYER. Well, I really cannot respond as to how likely votes are, but if there are votes, it would be my presumption that they would certainly be after 1:30 or 2 o'clock, not before.

Mr. SOLOMON. I see. And the original schedule that I saw said we were coming in at 10. That has been changed, and on Wednesday we will be coming in at noon on Wednesday?

□ 1310

Mr. HOYER. We are going to be coming in at noon, yes. We will ask for unanimous consent after this.

Mr. SOLOMON. And I notice that the general supplemental appropriation bill is scheduled. It does not make mention of the need for a rule, and I assume that that bill is going to be brought right directly to the floor.

Mr. HOYER. I believe that the chairman is not on the floor, but it is my understanding the chairman will be bringing that bill, under the rules, directly to the floor.

Mr. SOLOMON. I wonder how much debate time he might be asking for under a unanimous consent. Does anyone know that?

Mr. HOYER. I do not know. I am sure that the chairman will discuss that with the ranking member, in addition to the minority leadership.

Mr. SOLOMON. We appreciate that very much.

And just lastly, there is no mention made of votes on Friday. Could the membership expect votes on Friday?

Mr. HOYER. We do not know the answer to that question. We are hopeful that there will not be the necessity to have votes on Friday, but we cannot now tell Members that there will be no votes on Friday.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for enlightening us, and I hope the gentleman has a nice weekend.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I reciprocate those wishes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

**HOOR OF MEETING ON
WEDNESDAY, MAY 19, 1993**

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Tuesday, May 18, 1993, it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday, May 19, 1993.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORDON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

**ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY,
MAY 13, 1993, TO MONDAY, MAY
17, 1993**

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the

House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

**DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR
WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON
WEDNESDAY NEXT**

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

**APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF
DELEGATION TO ATTEND MEETING
OF THE CANADA-UNITED
STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY
GROUP**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to the provisions of 22 U.S.C. 276d, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment as members of the United States delegation to attend the meeting of the Canada-United States interparliamentary group the following Members of the House: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Chairman; Mr. LAFALCE of New York, Vice Chairman; Mr. OBERSTAR of Minnesota; Mr. GIBBONS of Florida; Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana; Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota; Mr. HASTINGS of Florida; and Mr. KOLBE of Arizona.

There was no objection.

A "TRUST" FUND?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I understand that our President has recommended a trust fund to put the taxes in that we really should not be increasing to pay off the debt. I have several comments relative to this:

First of all, Mr. Speaker, a trust fund? This implies that somebody has trust if they are going to set up a trust fund. What has happened to every other trust fund in our Treasury now is that the fund has been raped, it has been exploited, it is not there. Why should the voters feel that that trust fund would be any different than any other trust fund?

Second, Mr. Speaker, Milton Friedman has pointed out, which is true and history bears it out, that every time we increase taxes we increase the deficit. That is true because, as he says, Government will spend all the money it is given plus as much more as it can

get away with. When we increase taxes, we are simply going to increase the deficit, and, if we put those taxes in a so-called trust fund, that is not going to decrease the deficit because with our right hand we may pay off a little of the debt, but with our left hand we are going to borrow more money in order to fund the increased spending that is bound to result as a result of increased taxes.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, even if it were legitimate, why do we need a trust fund? We are like a family that has about 20 credit cards run up to the max, so the wife says to the husband, "Why don't we set up a savings account to put our money in to pay off these credit card accounts?"

I say, "If you got money coming in, pay off the accounts. If the intent is to really use this money to pay off the debt, then pay off the debt. You don't need a trust fund, you don't need a savings account, to pay off the debt."

The whole thing obviously is disingenuous, it is a gimmick, it is a sham, and I think almost everyone in America finds it is transparent.

WHY H.R. 820 IS A BAD BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, today we were asked to vote on a competitiveness bill which adds \$1½ billion to our deficit over the next 2 years.

When are we going to learn that we don't get more competitive by going deeper and deeper into debt?

This administration is not listening to the American people. Americans want debt reduction. Not a bigger and bigger deficit. This bill adds \$1½ billion of future deficit. The bottom line is that this bill costs too much. This bill is bad fiscal policy.

Let's fact it. This bill authorizes massive new spending that flies in the face of debt reduction. If we wanted to make American competitiveness, we should be passing bills to cut the cost of this huge Federal bureaucracy—we would be working to balance the Federal budget—we certainly would not be standing here today voting on a bill that increases the deficit by \$1½ billion. We would be working for tax cuts not tax increases.

Because new taxes mean higher prices which means we are less competitive, this great country of ours will only become more competitive by lowering prices and raising productivity. But neither of these will ever be accomplished by burying businesses in more taxes and more regulations.

If we were truly committed to returning America to her rightful place as No. 1 in competitiveness around the world, then we would be passing an indexed capital gains tax capped at 20 percent.

It is ludicrous to think that we will be more competitive with a bigger deficit and higher taxes.

H.R. 820 is misnamed. We should call it the national increase the deficit act. The administration and the authors of this bill have offered taxpayers a hoax. You can't make a silk purse out of a pig's ear. This bill adds to our deficit, no matter how you look at it.

There is a hard core in this Congress who are dedicated to spending the hard-earned tax dollars provided by wage earners, small businesses and retired persons on fixed incomes.

I just answered a letter from a 71-year-old gentleman who said he would pay higher taxes if his tax money went to retire the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, how could I possibly vote for H.R. 820 and then look this old gentleman in the eye? H.R. 820 is a bad bill I urge you to vote "no."

□ 1320

TAXPAYER DEBT BUYDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, some months ago the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. SMITH] and I, created a concept known as taxpayer debt buydown. The idea was to allow people to voluntarily take some of the money that they were already paying in taxes, put it into a fund to buy down the national debt, and then for every dollar put into debt buydown, one dollar would have to be subtracted from spending, thereby getting you both debt reduction and deficit reduction at the same time.

To assure people that that was not a gimmick of some sort we had that particular plan scored by the Congressional Budget Office. In other words, we had the Congressional Budget Office look at it to find out whether or not it would result in real savings.

The Congressional Budget Office took a look at it and said if it worked optimally, that this plan would in fact reduce the budget deficit so much that within 6 years you would end up balancing the Federal budget, and within 15 years totally abolish the entire national debt.

I make the point about this taxpayer debt buydown concept because in some ways some people may think it sounds remarkably similar to what President Clinton talked about yesterday when he talked about setting aside a trust fund for deficit reduction.

Let me tell you there is absolutely no relationship between the two. The deficit reduction trust fund that the President talked about yesterday is precisely the kind of gimmick that those of us who are really concerned about this issue were always afraid

someone would come forward with. In other words, all he does is say we are going to set money aside in a fund that is going to be used for deficit reduction, but he offers no spending cuts. If you do not have the same amount of spending cuts as you have deficit reduction, you have nothing.

In the case of the President's program, he ends up with nothing. There is no trust in his trust fund because it simply takes an accounting gimmick and makes it sound as though he is doing something for deficit reduction.

If in fact you want something to work, the money that is paid into the fund has to go for something real. In the case of the taxpayer debt buydown fund created by Senator SMITH and myself, what we have done is have the money used for specifically buying down the debt, and then we force Congress to subtract the same amount in spending. If Congress does not do the job, we require across-the-board cuts in the accounts of Government in order to achieve the savings. So you always get the savings at the end of the year.

Now, the reason why the Clinton administration would not come forward with a plan like that is it requires real spending cuts, spending cuts on the order of \$40 billion to \$50 billion a year to implement that kind of a plan. That is more than what they have been willing to talk about. In fact, they have not been willing to talk about any spending cuts in the first year. They load all of their spending cuts into what we call the outyears, out in 1998 and 1999. That just happens to follow after the next presidential election. Everybody knows that is a phony.

They then come along with a new phony gimmick of a trust fund for deficit reduction. It just will not sell. The American people are anxious to do something that is real. They will in fact set aside money. If you gave them the opportunity to have a 10-percent checkoff on their tax form for debt reduction, I am assured that 70 to 75 percent of the American people would probably participate in that kind of a program and we would really begin to have the debt bought down and begin to get at spending. But they are tired to death of the phoniness that comes out of Washington, of politicians reading polls and then trying to find some kind of gimmick that will allow them to sound like they are doing what the American people are asking them to do.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time we begin to do for real what the American people are asking us to do for real—cut the debt, for real cut the deficit, for real cut spending, and use the taxpayers' money responsibly for real. If we cannot do that, then the American people have every reason to say, "You are all phonies, and you all should go."

STUDY SHOWS GENERIC DRUGS DRAMATICALLY FIGHT HEALTH INFLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. STARK] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, generic pharmaceutical products, when available, allow consumers to escape brand name prescription drug price gouging. In a decade that saw brand name prescription drug prices shoot through the roof, the generic industry has operated in a competitive marketplace, offering consumers some real health care expenditure relief.

A recent study prepared by the University of Mississippi shows that wholesale generic drug prices have decreased over the past 5 years, while brand name drug prices have soared. The study found that continual decreases in selling prices is the norm for generic products.

The study finds that differences in market competition are a result of brand name drugs competing through product variation, whereas generics compete on the basis of price. I quote: "Due to the intensity of [generic] price competition, generic pharmaceutical manufacturers have not enjoyed the same pricing freedom that the manufacturers of branded pharmaceuticals have."

I recently introduced legislation that would promote awareness and usage of generic prescription drugs. The bill, H.R. 916, creates a Prescription Drug Prices Review Board, which will disseminate information to consumers about therapeutically equivalent alternatives to excessively priced drugs.

To encourage greater price competition among brand name drugs, the Board will have the ability to recapture tax credits and/or decrease patent length of excessively priced drugs.

The following charts represent the study's findings. It should be noted that half of the drugs which were tracked in the study have been tracked by GAO and Families USA analysts in their respective drug price studies with generally similar results.

TABLE 1.—BRANDED AND GENERIC PHARMACEUTICAL
PRODUCTS USED FOR THIS ANALYSIS

Brand	Compound
Darvon	propoxyphene Compound 65MG.
Elavil	amitriptyline 25mg.
Motrin	ibuprofen 400mg.
Inderal	propranolol 80mg.
Diabinese	chlorpropamide 100mg.
Tolinase	tolazemide 100mg.
Valium	diazepam 5mg.
Restoril	temazepam 15mg.
Dalmane	flurazepam 15mg.
Tylenol 3	APAP w/codeine #3.
Bactrim	sulfamethoxazole/trimethoprim.
Lasix	furosemide 20mg.

Prescription drug	Price (dollars)					Percent change in price 1988- 92
	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	
Darvon	18.41	20.07	21.88	23.84	26.07	41.6
Generic 1	6.23	4.55	4.55	5.35	5.69	-8.7
Generic 2	5.95	4.01	4.95	5.63	5.91	-0.7
Elavil	20.61	22.57	24.04	27.61	27.61	33.9
Generic 1	1.25	0.88	0.88	0.98	1.04	-16.8
Generic 2	1.32	1.32	1.42	1.42	1.42	7.5
Motrin	13.85	13.85	13.85	13.85	14.49	4.6
Generic 1	5.31	2.34	2.34	2.34	2.34	-55.8

Prescription drug	Price (dollars)					Percent change in price 1988- 92
	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	
Generic 2	5.57	4.65	4.65	4.65	4.65	-16.5
Inderal	37.97	41.58	51.83	54.94	57.36	51.1
Generic 1	4.01	2.72	1.67	1.66	1.84	-54.1
Generic 2	1.43	1.43	1.43	1.81	1.81	26.6
Diabinese	17.43	19.13	22.05	24.34	26.55	52.1
Generic 1	1.37	1.28	1.17	1.24	1.36	0
Generic 2	1.26	1.26	1.26	1.41	1.47	16.7
Tolinase	13.88	15.25	16.47	17.79	18.98	36.7
Generic 1	5.71	5.71	4.75	3.24	3.35	-41.3
Generic 2	3.01	3.01	3.01	3.88	4.37	45.2
Valium	26.78	33.88	36.89	40.41	44.56	66.4
Generic 1	1.84	1.84	1.42	1.42	1.27	-30.9
Generic 2	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.75	1.25	-28.6
Restoril	25.94	31.25	37.49	41.33	46.79	80.4
Generic 1	7.95	8.81	4.94	3.61	3.61	-54.7
Generic 2	11.81	4.99	4.99	4.99	4.99	-57.7
Dalmane	23.74	31.43	34.23	37.49	41.34	74.1
Generic 1	11.31	9.19	4.99	4.99	4.99	-55.8
Generic 2	12.11	8.28	4.95	4.95	4.95	-59.1
Bactrim	31.88	39.52	43.04	47.13	53.69	68.4
Generic 1	7.35	4.01	4.08	4.08	4.08	-44.4
Generic 2	7.55	6.37	6.37	6.37	6.37	-15.6
Lasix	7.38	8.58	9.38	9.99	10.79	46.3
Generic 1	1.27	1.27	1.22	1.22	1.22	-3.9
Generic 2	1.27	1.21	1.27	1.42	1.42	11.8
Tylenol 3	14.12	16.17	17.29	19.38	23.09	63.7
Generic 1	4.71	3.21	3.21	3.21	3.21	-31.7

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MANZULLO (at the request of Mr. MICHEL), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. TANNER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore, entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIVINGSTON, for 60 minutes, on May 19 and 20.

Mr. WALKER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, for 5 minutes, on May 17.

Mr. HORN, for 20 minutes, on May 20.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCOTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. RUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. STARK, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland) and to include extraneous material:)

Mrs. ROUKEMA.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. MCCOLLUM.

Mr. ROHRBACHER.

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mr. HORN.

Mr. GILLMOR.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SCOTT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BECERRA.

Mr. OBEY.

Ms. ESHOO.

Mr. PASTOR.

Mr. GEJDESON.

Mr. HILLIARD.

Mrs. LOWEY.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALKER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. NADLER.

Mr. SHAYS.

Mr. RAMSTAD.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 214. An act to authorize the construction of a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor members of the Armed Forces who served in World War II and to commemorate U.S. participation in that conflict.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 17, 1993, at 12 noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. NATCHER: Committee on Appropriations. A report on Revised Subdivision of Budget Totals for Fiscal Year 1993 (Rept. 103-90). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. NATCHER: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 2118. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-91). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MONTGOMERY: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2034. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise and improve veterans' health programs, and for other purposes (Rept. 103-92). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECERRA (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. EDWARDS of California,

Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. TORRES):

H.R. 2119. A bill to establish an Immigration Enforcement Review Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 2120. A bill to prohibit the furnishing of international security to countries that consistently oppose the United States position in the United Nations General Assembly; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MINETA (for himself and Mr. SHUSTER):

H.R. 2121. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, relating to procedures for resolving claims involving unfilled, negotiated transportation rates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. HOEKSTRA:

H.R. 2122. A bill to extend until January 1, 1995, the existing suspension of duty on bendiocarb; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 2123. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on N,N-dimethyl-N-(3-((methylamino)carbonyl)oxyphenyl) methanimide monohydrochloride; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNOLLENBERG:

H.R. 2124. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to limit the tax rate for certain small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 2125. A bill to make an exception to the United States embargo on trade with Cuba for the export of medicines or medical supplies, instruments, or equipment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SHAYS:

H.R. 2126. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. WELDON (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey):

H.R. 2127. A bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to establish a new comprehensive child welfare services program under part E, to make other amendments to the program under parts B and E, and for

other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 26: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 349: Mr. MICA, Mr. QUINN, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. HOKE.
H.R. 357: Mr. INSLEE.
H.R. 513: Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MINGE, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. HORN, Mr. HUFFINGTON, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. LEVY, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
H.R. 943: Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. SABO, Ms. FURSE, Mr. WILSON, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. VENTO, and Mrs. KENNELLY.
H.R. 1009: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 1105: Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. SOLOMON, and Mr. KIM.
H.R. 1142: Mr. HASTERT and Mr. WILLIAMS.
H.R. 1181: Mr. LEWIS of California.
H.R. 1222: Mr. MACHTLEY.
H.R. 1360: Mr. TORRES, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 1492: Ms. MOLINARI.
H.R. 1609: Mr. SERRANO, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1710: Mr. DICKEY, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Ms. DUNN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. COBLE, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. CANADY, and Mr. PETRI.
H.R. 1762: Mr. McHUGH.
H.R. 1763: Mr. SWETT.
H.R. 1900: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. SKAGGS.
H.R. 1911: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. BYRNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Mr. KOPETSKI.
H.R. 1912: Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mrs. THURMAN, Ms.

BYRNE, Mr. RANGEL, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 2043: Mr. CLAY, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. BORSKI, and Mr. BECERRA.

H.J. Res. 6: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.J. Res. 108: Mr. VENTO.

H.J. Res. 133: Mr. BEREUTER and Mr. MINGE.

H.J. Res. 184: Mr. APPEGATE, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. HORN, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. KASICH, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. SISISKY.

H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. WYNN, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. WHEAT, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. CLAY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H. Res. 26: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. LAZIO, and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H. Res. 86: Mr. HOKE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. KOLBE, and Mrs. VUCANOVICH.

H. Res. 127: Mr. MACHTLEY.

H. Res. 148: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin and Ms. FURSE.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

36. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Killeen Industrial Development Department, Killeen, TX, relative to the Direct Student Loan Processing System; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

37. Also, petition of county of Sampson, Clinton, NC, relative to Federal tax on the sale of cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

38. Also, petition of Nash County, Nashville, NC, relative to the tax on the sale of cigarettes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.